arXiv:1403.5282v1 [math.QA] 20 Mar 2014

REGULAR MULTIPLIER HOPF ALGEBROIDS II. INTEGRATION ON AND DUALITY OF ALGEBRAIC QUANTUM GROUPOIDS

THOMAS TIMMERMANN

Abstract. A fundamental feature of quantum groups is that many come in pairs of mutually dual objects, like finite-dimensional Hopf algebras and their duals, or quantisations of function algebras and of universal enveloping algebras of Poisson-Lie groups.

The same phenomenon was studied for quantum groupoids in various settings. In the purely algebraic setup, the construction of a dual object was given by Schauenburg and by Kadison and Szlachányi, but required the quantum groupoid to be finite with respect to the base. A sophisticated duality for measured quantum groupoids was developed by Enock, Lesieur and Vallin in the setting of von Neumann algebras.

We propose a purely algebraic duality theory without any finiteness assumptions, generalising Van Daele's duality theory of multiplier Hopf algebras and borrowing ideas from the theory of measured quantum groupoids. Our approach is based on the multiplier Hopf algebroids recently introduced by Van Daele and the author, and on a new approach to integration on algebraic quantum groupoids. The main concept are left and right integrals on regular multiplier Hopf algebroids that are adapted to quasi-invariant weights on the basis. Given such integrals, we show that they are unique up to rescaling, admit modular automorphisms, and that left and right ones are related by modular elements. Then, we construct, without any finiteness or Frobenius assumption, a dual multiplier Hopf algebroid with integrals and prove biduality.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
Preliminaries 7
2. Regular multiplier Hopf algebroids 8
2.1. Left multiplier bialgebroids 8
2.2. Right multiplier bialgebroids 9
2.3. Regular multiplier Hopf algebroids 10
3. Integration 13
3.1. Invariant elements of dual modules 13
3.2. Base weights and adapted integrals 16
3.3. Uniqueness of integrals 18
3.4. Convolution operators and the modular automorphism 22

Date: March 24, 2014.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16T05.

Key words and phrases. bialgebroids, Hopf algebroids, weak Hopf algebras, quantum groupoids, Pontrjagin duality, integrals.

Supported by the SFB 878 "Groups, geometry and actions" funded by the DFG.

3.5. More on convolution operators, and the modular element 25
3.6. Faithfulness 29
4. Duality 30
4.1. The dual algebra and dual quantum graphs 30
4.2. The dual regular multiplier Hopf algebroid 33
4.3. The full duality and biduality 38
4.4. The duality on the level of multipliers 41
5. Examples 45
5.1. Étale groupoids 45
5.2. A two-sided crossed product 48
Appendix A. Factorisable functionals on bimodules 54
Acknowledgements 55
References 55

1. Introduction

Quantum groupoids generalize quantum groups in a way that, briefly, amounts to replacing the ground field with a pair of anti-isomorphic base algebras which may be non-commutative. They appeared in a variety of situations, for example, as generalized Galois symmetries for depth 2 inclusions of factors or algebras [5], [15], [16], [20], [21], [32], as dynamical quantum groups [13], [18], [22], or as Tannaka-Krein duals of certain tensor categories of bimodules [19], [31], [35], and were studied by methods of pure algebra [2], [4], [6], [30, 47], [45], [46], [38], [33], category theory [7], [9], [10], [12] and operator algebras [15], [17], [29].

A fundamental feature of quantum groups is that many come in pairs of mutually dual objects, like finite-dimensional Hopf algebras and their dual spaces, function and convolution algebras of groups, or quantisations of function algebras and of universal enveloping algebras of Lie-Poisson groups [8], [23]. The same phenomenon was observed for quantum groupoids, where examples include Hopf algebroids that are fiber-wise finite-dimensional [21], the Galois symmetries for depth 2 inclusions mentioned above, and the function and the convolution algebras of groupoids.

In the finite-dimensional case, this duality can be explained as follows. A (finite-dimensional) quantum group or Hopf algebra is a vector space A with a multiplication $m\colon A\otimes A\to A$ and a comultiplication $\Delta\colon A\to A\otimes A$ satisfying a few conditions, and the dual space $A^\vee$ turns out to be a Hopf algebra again with respect to the dual maps $\Delta^\vee$ and $m^\vee$. The key is that one can identify $A^\vee\otimes A^\vee$ with the dual of $A\otimes A$. Iterating this construction, one obtains the bidual $(A^\vee)^\vee$ which is naturally isomorphic to A. A simple example is given by the group algebra $A=\mathbb{C}G$ of a finite group G, where the comultiplication Δ extends the diagonal map $G\to G\times G$, and the dual $A^\vee$ is the function algebra $C(G)$ with the comultiplication $\Delta^\vee\colon \delta_x\mapsto\sum_{x=yz}\delta_y\otimes\delta_z$.

Replacing the Hopf algebra with a weak Hopf algebra, one obtains the corresponding duality for finite-dimensional quantum groupoids. More generally, Schauenburg [37] and

Kadison and Szlachányi [21] extended this duality to Hopf algebroids under the assumption that the underlying algebra A is projective and finite as a module over the base algebras, see also [1].

In the infinite-dimensional case, the situation is more delicate. One regards two Hopf algebras A and D as mutually dual if one has a non-degenerate bilinear form on $A \times D$ such that the embeddings $A \hookrightarrow D^\vee$ and $D \hookrightarrow A^\vee$ make the following diagrams commute,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{\Delta_A} & A \otimes A \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ D^\vee & \xrightarrow[m_D^\vee]{} & (D \otimes D)^\vee, \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} D & \xrightarrow{\Delta_D} & D \otimes D \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ A^\vee & \xrightarrow[m_A^\vee]{} & (A \otimes A)^\vee, \end{array}$$

and this definition carries over to Hopf algebroids. But given a Hopf algebra or Hopf algebroid A, the existence of a dual object D is not known without further assumptions. For example, if $A = \mathbb{C}G$ is the group algebra of an infinite group G, the natural choice for D is the algebra $C_c(G)$ of finitely supported functions on G with pointwise multiplication, but the comultiplication $\delta_x \mapsto \sum_{x=yz} \delta_y \otimes \delta_z$ does not take values in $D \otimes D$.

For quantum groups, an elegant algebraic and a powerful operator-algebraic approach to duality were developed by Van Daele [42] and Kustermans and Vaes [25, 26]. Both approaches are closely related [27] and share the main assumption, which is the existence of left- and right-invariant integrals ϕ and ψ on the quantum group. These integrals correspond to integration of functions on a group with respect to the Haar measure, are essentially unique, possess modular automorphisms and are related by a modular element. In the purely algebraic theory of Van Daele [42], the second main idea is to allow the algebra A to be non-unital and the comultiplication Δ to take values in a multiplier algebra such that the maps

$$T_1 \colon a \otimes b \mapsto \Delta(a)(1 \otimes b) \qquad \text{and} \qquad T_2 \colon a \otimes b \mapsto (a \otimes 1)\Delta(b)$$

define bijections of $A \otimes A$. For example, the function algebra $C_c(G)$ of an infinite group G fits into this framework. Then, the subspace $\hat{A} \subseteq A^\vee$ spanned by all functionals on A of the form $a \cdot \phi \colon a' \mapsto \phi(a'a)$ carries the structure of a multiplier Hopf algebra such that the associated bijections $\hat{T}_1$ and $\hat{T}_2$ make the following diagrams commute,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \hat{A} \otimes \hat{A} & \xrightarrow{\hat{T}_1} & \hat{A} \otimes \hat{A} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (A \otimes A)^\vee & \xrightarrow[(T_2)^\vee]{} & (A \otimes A)^\vee, \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} \hat{A} \otimes \hat{A} & \xrightarrow{\hat{T}_2} & \hat{A} \otimes \hat{A} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (A \otimes A)^\vee & \xrightarrow[(T_1)^\vee]{} & (A \otimes A)^\vee, \end{array}$$

and this dual multiplier Hopf algebra $\hat{A}$ has left and right integrals $\hat{\phi}$ and $\hat{\psi}$. Finally, the bidual $\hat{\hat{A}}$ is naturally isomorphic to A [42].

In this paper, we extend the algebraic approach of Van Daele to quantum groupoids and obtain an algebraic duality theory without any finiteness restrictions, but at the cost of assuming the existence of integrals. Let us note that the operator-algebraic approach of Kustermans and Vaes has been generalised to quantum groupoids by Enock, Lesieur and Vallin [15], [17], [29] using a formidable array of sophisticated von Neumann algebra techniques like Tomita-Takesaki theory.

Let us outline our approach, the main results and the organisation of this article in some detail.

Among the different algebraic approaches to quantum groupoids, we choose the framework of multiplier Hopf algebroids developed in [40]. The latter generalize Hopf algebroids in a similar way like multiplier Hopf algebras generalize Hopf algebras, and weak multiplier Hopf algebras in a similar way like Hopf algebroids generalize weak Hopf algebras; see [41].

The main definitions and results of [40] are summarised in *Section 2*. Roughly, a *regular multiplier Hopf algebroid* consists of an algebra A, possibly without unit, two anti-isomorphic subalgebras $B, C \subseteq M(A)$, and a left- and a right-handed comultiplication Δ_B and Δ_C such that the maps

$$\begin{aligned} &T_\lambda \colon a \otimes b \mapsto \Delta_B(b)(a \otimes 1), \quad T_\rho \colon a \otimes b \mapsto \Delta_B(a)(1 \otimes b), \\ &{}_\lambda T \colon a \otimes b \mapsto (a \otimes 1)\Delta_C(b), \quad {}_\rho T \colon a \otimes b \mapsto (1 \otimes b)\Delta_C(a) \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

induce bijections between various tensor products of A, where A is regarded as a module over B or C, respectively. This bijectivity condition is equivalent to the existence of a left- and a right-handed counit and an antipode.

The first step towards the desired duality of such multiplier Hopf algebroids, taken in *Section 3*, is to identify a good notion of left and right integrals on them and to prove that, similar as in the theory of quantum groups [25], [26], [43] and of measured quantum groupoids [16], [29], such integrals are unique up to rescaling, admit modular automorphisms, and are related by modular elements.

The main property of integrals, which is left- or right-invariance with respect to the comultiplications Δ_B and Δ_C, can at first sight only be formulated for C- or B-bilinear maps ${}_C\phi_C \colon A \to C$ or ${}_B\psi_B \colon A \to B$, respectively, and amounts to the relations

$$(\iota \otimes {}_C\phi_C)((a \otimes 1)\Delta_C(b)) = a\,{}_C\phi_C(b) \quad \text{or} \quad ({}_B\psi_B \otimes \iota)(\Delta_B(a)(1 \otimes b)) = {}_B\psi_B(a)\,b$$

for all $a, b \in A$, respectively. These invariance conditions are studied in *Subsection 3.1*.

To construct a dual multiplier Hopf algebroid, we need to complement such invariant, faithful maps ${}_C\phi_C \colon A \to C$ and ${}_B\psi_B \colon A \to B$ with faithful functionals μ_B and μ_C on B and C, respectively, which are *quasi-invariant* with respect to ${}_C\phi_C$ and ${}_B\psi_B$ in the sense that the compositions $\phi := \mu_C \circ {}_C\phi_C$ and $\psi := \mu_B \circ {}_B\psi_B$ satisfy

$$\phi \cdot A = A \cdot \phi = \psi \cdot A = A \cdot \psi \tag{1.2}$$

as subsets of the dual space $A^\vee$. Here, $\phi \cdot A$ denotes the space of all functionals of the form $b \mapsto \phi(ab)$ with $a \in A$, and the other spaces are defined similarly. If ϕ and ψ are faithful, then equation (1.2) implies the existence of modular automorphisms for ϕ and ψ and of a modular element $\delta = \mathrm{d}\psi / \mathrm{d}\phi \in M(A)$ satisfying $\phi(-\delta) = \psi$.

In the setting of multiplier Hopf algebras, Van Daele showed that equation (1.2) is automatically satisfied as soon as ϕ and ψ are non-zero. In the present context, the situation is more delicate. Equation (1.2) implies that the functionals ϕ and ψ can be written in the form

$$\phi = \mu_C \circ {}_C\phi_C = \mu_B \circ {}_B\phi = \mu_B \circ \phi_B, \quad \psi = \mu_B \circ {}_B\psi_B = \mu_C \circ {}_C\psi = \mu_C \circ \psi_C \tag{1.3}$$

with a left-invariant map ${}_C\phi_C\colon A \to C$ and a right-invariant map ${}_B\psi_B\colon A \to B$, respectively, and uniquely determined maps of left or right B- or C-modules

$$(1.4) \qquad {}_B\phi\colon {}_BA \to {}_BB, \qquad \phi_B\colon A_B \to B_B, \qquad {}_C\psi\colon {}_CA \to {}_CC, \qquad \psi_C\colon A_C \to C_C.$$

Instead of assuming (1.2), we reverse the approach and first fix faithful functionals μ_B and μ_C on the base algebras B and C, respectively. In setting of weak (multiplier) Hopf algebras, such functionals are given canonically, but in the present context, there is potentially a large choice, similar as in the case of classical groupoids. They key assumption that we impose on μ_B and μ_C is the left or the right counit ${}_B\varepsilon\colon A \to B$ and $\varepsilon_C \to A \to C$, respectively, yield the same functional $\varepsilon := \mu_B \circ {}_B\varepsilon = \mu_C \circ \varepsilon_C$ on A. This assumption also implies that S^{-2} and S^2 form modular automorphisms for μ_B and μ_C, respectively. Then, we take the existence of factorisations as in (1.3) as the definition of a *left integral* ϕ and a *right integral* ψ on A. This is done in *Subsection 3.2*.

The main result of *Section 3* is that equation (1.2) holds automatically if the integrals ϕ and ψ are faithful in the ordinary sense and *full* in the sense that the associated maps in (1.4) are surjective. The first step is taken in *Subsection 3.3*, where we also show that integrals are unique up to rescaling, or, more precisely, that the maps

$$M(B) \to A^\vee,\ x \mapsto x \cdot \phi = \phi(-x), \qquad M(C) \to A^\vee,\ y \mapsto y \cdot \psi = \psi(-y)$$

define bijections between $M(B)$ or $M(C)$ on one side and the space of left or right integrals on A, respectively, on the other side. The second step is taken in *Subsection 3.4* and involves the study of natural convolution operators associated to elements of the space (1.2).

Given a full and faithful left integral ϕ, the compositions $\psi = \phi \circ S^{-1}$ and $\psi^\dagger := \phi \circ S$ are right integrals, and equation (1.2) implies that there exist modular elements $\delta, \delta^\dagger \in M(A)$ such that $\psi = \phi \cdot \delta$ and $\psi^\dagger = \delta^\dagger \cdot \phi$. In *Subsection 3.5*, we study the interplay of these modular elements with the comultiplication, antipode and counit, and establish all the formulas that one would expect from the theory of multiplier Hopf algebras.

Finally, we show that a full integral is automatically faithful if A is projective as a module over the base algebras B and C. This result generalizes the corresponding result of Van Daele for multiplier Hopf algebras and is proved in *Subsection 3.6*.

The main result of this article, which is the duality of measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroids, is established in *Section 4*.

We define a *measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid* to be a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid equipped with faithful functionals μ_B, μ_C as above and full and faithful left and right integrals ϕ and ψ. Given such a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid, we equip the subspace $\hat{A} := \phi \cdot A = A \cdot \phi = \psi \cdot A = A \cdot \psi$ of $A^\vee$ with a convolution product $(\upsilon, \omega) \mapsto \upsilon * \omega$ such that, roughly,

$$(\upsilon \otimes \omega) \circ \Delta_B = \upsilon * \omega = (\upsilon \otimes \omega) \circ \Delta_C,$$

and with natural embeddings of $\hat{C} := B$ and $\hat{B} := C$ into $M(\hat{A})$; see *Subsection 4.1*. Note that the compositions on the left and on the right hand side do not make sense as they stand because Δ_B and Δ_C take values in multiplier algebras of certain balanced tensor products of A. The main difficulty, however, is to show that the two compositions

coincide. This problem is solved in *Subsection 3.4* by a careful analysis of the left and right convolution operators on A given by the compositions

$$(\upsilon \otimes \iota) \circ \Delta_B, \qquad (\upsilon \otimes \iota) \circ \Delta_C, \qquad (\iota \otimes \omega) \circ \Delta_B, \qquad (\iota \otimes \omega) \circ \Delta_C,$$

and here the assumption $\mu_B \circ {}_B\varepsilon = \mu_C \circ \varepsilon_C$ becomes crucial.

We then equip $\hat{A} \subseteq A^\vee$ with comultiplications $\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{B}}$ and $\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{C}}$ such that the maps

$$\hat{T}_\lambda \colon \upsilon \otimes \omega \mapsto \hat{\Delta}_{\hat{B}}(\omega)(\upsilon \otimes 1), \qquad \hat{T}_\rho \colon \upsilon \otimes \omega \mapsto \hat{\Delta}_{\hat{B}}(\upsilon)(1 \otimes \omega),$$
$${}_\lambda\hat{T} \colon \upsilon \otimes \omega \mapsto (\upsilon \otimes 1)\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{C}}(\omega), \qquad {}_\rho\hat{T} \colon \upsilon \otimes \omega \mapsto (1 \otimes \omega)\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{C}}(\upsilon)$$

dualise the maps in (1.1). More precisely, we first show that the transposes of the maps in (1.1) restrict to bijections between certain balanced tensor products of $\hat{A}$ with itself, and then that these restrictions form multiplicative pairs in the sense of [40] so that, by results in [40], they correspond to comultiplications $\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{B}}$ and $\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{C}}$ as stated above. This is the contents of *Subsection 4.2*.

To obtain the full duality result, we show *in Subsection 4.3* that, as in the case of multiplier Hopf algebras [43], the maps

$$\hat{\psi} \colon a \cdot \phi \mapsto \varepsilon(a) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \hat{\phi} \colon \psi \cdot a \mapsto \varepsilon(a)$$

form a right and a left integral on $\hat{A}$ so that one obtains a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid again, and that the natural map $A \to (\hat{A})^\vee$ identifies A with the bidual $\hat{\hat{A}}$ as a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid. Finally, we study the duality between the multiplication and the comultiplication on A and $\hat{A}$ on the level of the multiplier algebras $M(A)$ and $M(\hat{A})$; see *Subsection 4.4*.

Two examples of mutually dual measured multiplier Hopf algebroids are discussed in the final *Section 5* — the function algebra and the convolution algebra of an étale, locally compact, Hausdorff groupoid, and a two-sided crossed product which appeared in [11].

The material developed in this article raises several questions that will have to be addressed separately.

Given the theory of integrals developed here, one should be able to construct (operator-algebraic) measured quantum groupoids out of suitable (algebraic) measured multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroids, similarly as it was done for multiplier Hopf algebras by Kustermans and Van Daele in [24] and [28], and for dynamical quantum groups in [39]. An important assumption in the theory of measured quantum groupoids is that the modular automorphism groups of the left and of the right integral commute, and it would be desirable to study the implications of this assumption in the present context.

An important question concerns the implications of existence of integrals on the theory of corepresentations. It seems natural to expect that under suitable assumptions on the base algebras B and C, many results on the corepresentation theory of compact quantum groups carry over to measured regular Hopf $*$-algebroids.

One should also clarify the relation to the duality obtained by Schauenburg [37], Kadison and Szlachányi [21] and Böhm [1] in the case where A is unital and finitely generated projective as a module over B and C.

Preliminaries. We shall use the following conventions and terminology.

All algebras and modules will be complex vector spaces and all homomorphisms will be linear maps, but much of the theory developed in this article applies in wider generality.

The identity map on a set X will be denoted by ι_X or simply ι.

Let B be an algebra, not necessarily unital. We denote by B^{op} the *opposite algebra*, which has the same underlying vector space as B, but the reversed multiplication.

Given a right module M over B, we write M_B if we want to emphasize that M is regarded as a right B-module. We call M_B *faithful* if for each non-zero $b \in B$ there exists an $m \in M$ such that mb is non-zero, *non-degenerate* if for each non-zero $m \in M$ there exists a $b \in B$ such that mb is non-zero, *idempotent* if $MB = M$, and we say that M_B *has local units in* B if for every finite subset $F \subset M$ there exists a $b \in B$ with $mb = m$ for all $m \in F$. Note that the last property implies the preceding two. We denote by $M_B^\vee := \mathrm{Hom}(M_B, B_B)$ the dual module, and by $f^\vee \colon N_B^\vee \to M_B^\vee$ the dual of a morphism $f \colon M \to N$ of right B-modules, given by $f^\vee(\chi) = \chi \circ f$. We use the same notation for duals of vector spaces and of linear maps. We furthermore denote by $L(M_B) := \mathrm{Hom}(B_B, M_B)$ the space of *left multipliers* of the module M_B.

For left modules, we obtain the corresponding notation and terminology by identifying left B-modules with right B^{op}-modules. We denote by $R({}_BM) := \mathrm{Hom}({}_BB, {}_BM)$ the space of *right multipliers* of a left B-module ${}_BM$.

We write B_B or ${}_BB$ when we regard B as a right or left module over itself with respect to right or left multiplication. We say that the algebra B is *non-degenerate*, *idempotent*, or *has local units* if the modules ${}_BB$ and B_B both are non-degenerate, idempotent or both have local units in B, respectively. Note that the last property again implies the preceding two.

We denote by $L(B) = \mathrm{End}(B_B)$ and $R(B) = \mathrm{End}({}_BB)^{\mathrm{op}}$ the algebras of left or right multipliers of B, respectively, where the multiplication in the latter algebra is given by $(fg)(b) := g(f(b))$. Note that B_B or ${}_BB$ is non-degenerate if and only if the natural map from B to $L(B)$ or $R(B)$, respectively, is injective. If B_B is non-degenerate, we define the multiplier algebra of B to be the subalgebra $M(B) := \{t \in L(B) : Bt \subseteq B\} \subseteq L(B)$, where we identify B with its image in $L(B)$. Likewise we could define $M(B) = \{t \in R(B) : tB \subseteq B\}$ if ${}_BB$ is non-degenerate. If both definitions make sense, that is, if B is non-degenerate, then they evidently coincide up to a natural identification, and a multiplier is given by a pair of maps $t_R, t_L \colon B \to B$ satisfying $t_R(a)b = at_L(b)$ for all $a, b \in B$.

Given a left or right B-module M and a space N, we regard the space of linear maps from M to N as a right or left B-module, where $(f \cdot b)(m) = f(bm)$ or $(b \cdot f)(m) = f(mb)$ for all maps f and all elements $b \in B$ and $m \in M$, respectively.

In particular, we regard the dual space $B^\vee$ of a non-degenerate, idempotent algebra B as a bimodule over $M(B)$, where $(a \cdot \omega \cdot b)(c) = \omega(bca)$, and call a functional $\omega \in B^\vee$ *faithful* if the maps $B \to B^\vee$ given by $d \mapsto d \cdot \omega$ and $d \mapsto \omega \cdot d$ are injective, that is, $\omega(dB) \neq 0$ and $\omega(Bd) \neq 0$ whenever $d \neq 0$.

We say that a functional $\omega \in B^\vee$ *admits a modular automorphism* if there exists an automorphism σ of B such that $\omega(ab) = \omega(b\sigma(a))$ for all $a, b \in B$. One easily verifies that this condition holds if and only if $B \cdot \omega = \omega \cdot B$, and that then σ is characterised by the relation $\sigma(b) \cdot \omega = \omega \cdot b$ for all $b \in B$.

Assume that B is a $*$-algebra. We call a functional $\omega \in B^\vee$ *self-adjoint* if it coincides with $\omega^* = * \circ \omega \circ *$, that is, $\omega(a^*) = \omega(a)^*$ for all $a \in B$, and *positive* if additionally $\omega(a^*a) \geq 0$ for all $a \in A$.

2. Regular multiplier Hopf algebroids

This section summarises the definition and main properties of regular multiplier Hopf algebroids. The latter were introduced in [40] as non-unital generalizations of Hopf algebroids, and are special cases of multiplier bialgebroids. As such, they consist of a left and a right multiplier bialgebroid, which in turn consist of a left or a right quantum graph with a left or right comultiplication that are compatible in a certain sense.

2.1. **Left multiplier bialgebroids.** A *left quantum graph* is a tuple $\mathcal{A}_B = (B, A, s, t)$, where (1) B and A are algebras and A_A is non-degenerate as a right A-module, (2) $s\colon B \to M(A)$ is a homomorphism and $t\colon B \to M(A)$ is an anti-homomorphism such that their images commute, (3) the B-modules ${}_sA$ and ${}_tA$ are faithful, non-degenerate and idempotent, and (4a) the A-module A_A has local units in A or (4b) the B-modules ${}_sA$ and ${}_tA$ are flat. Here, we write ${}_sA$, A_t, ${}_tA$ or A_s when we regard A as a left or right B-module via $x \cdot a := s(x)a$, $y \cdot a := at(y)$, $a \cdot x := as(x)$ or $a \cdot y := t(y)a$, respectively. By assumption on ${}_sA$ and ${}_tA$, the maps s and t extend to maps from $M(B)$ to $L(A)$.

Given a left quantum graph $\mathcal{A}_B = (B, A, s, t)$, we denote by $A \underset{l}{\otimes} A := {}_sA \otimes {}_tA$ the tensor product of B-modules, or rather B^{op}-modules, regard this as a right $M(A)\otimes M(A)$-module in the canonical way, and denote by $L_{\mathrm{reg}}(A_B{\times}A) \subseteq \mathrm{End}(A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)$ the subalgebra consisting of all maps v such that $v_\lambda(a)(1 \otimes b) = v(a \otimes b) = v_\rho(b)(a \otimes 1)$ for some well-defined maps $v_\lambda, v_\rho\colon A \to A \underset{l}{\otimes} A$ and all $a, b \in A$. A *left comultiplication* for the left quantum graph $\mathcal{A}_B$ is a homomorphism $\Delta_B\colon A \to L_{\mathrm{reg}}(A_B{\times}A)$ satisfying

$$\Delta_B(s(x)t(y)as(x')t(y')) = (t(y) \otimes s(x))\Delta_B(a)(t(y') \otimes s(x')), \tag{2.1}$$

$$((\Delta_B \otimes \iota)(\Delta_B(b)(1 \otimes c)))(a \otimes 1 \otimes 1) = ((\iota \otimes \Delta_B)(\Delta_B(b)(a \otimes 1)))(1 \otimes 1 \otimes c) \tag{2.2}$$

for all $a, b, c \in A$ and $x, x', y, y' \in B$.

A *left multiplier bialgebroid* is a left quantum graph $\mathcal{A}_B$ with a left comultiplication Δ_B as above. Associated to such a left comultiplication are the *canonical maps*

$$T_\lambda\colon A \overset{t}{\otimes} A \to A \underset{l}{\otimes} A, \qquad T_\rho\colon A \underset{s}{\otimes} A \to A \underset{l}{\otimes} A, \tag{2.3}$$

$$T_\lambda(a \otimes b) = \Delta_B(b)(a \otimes 1), \qquad T_\rho(a \otimes b) = \Delta_B(a)(1 \otimes b), \tag{2.4}$$

where $A \overset{t}{\otimes} A := {}_tA \otimes A_t$ and $A \underset{s}{\otimes} A := A_s \otimes {}_sA$. These maps satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} T_\rho(s(x)t(y)at(y') \otimes t(z)b) &= (t(y) \otimes s(x))T_\rho(a \otimes b)(t(y')s(z) \otimes 1), \\ T_\lambda(s(z)a \otimes t(y)s(x)bs(x')) &= (t(y) \otimes s(x))T_\lambda(a \otimes b)(1 \otimes t(z)s(x')) \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

for all $x, x', y, y', z \in B$, $a, b \in A$ and make the following diagrams commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \overset{t}{\otimes} A \underset{s}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{\iota\otimes T_\rho} & A \overset{t}{\otimes} A \underset{l}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle T_\lambda\otimes\iota}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle m\Sigma\otimes\iota} \\ A \underset{l}{\otimes} A \underset{s}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{\iota\otimes m} & A \underset{l}{\otimes} A, \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} A \overset{t}{\otimes} A \underset{s}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{\iota\otimes T_\rho} & A \overset{t}{\otimes} A \underset{l}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle T_\lambda\otimes\iota}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle T_\lambda\otimes\iota} \\ A \underset{l}{\otimes} A \underset{s}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{\iota\otimes T_\rho} & A \underset{l}{\otimes} A \underset{l}{\otimes} A, \end{array} \tag{2.6}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A \underset{s}{\otimes} A \underset{s}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{m\otimes\iota} & A \underset{s}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{T_\rho} & A \underset{l}{\otimes} A, \\ {\scriptstyle \iota\otimes T_\rho}\downarrow & & & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle m\otimes\iota} \\ A_s \otimes_{(1\otimes s)} (A \underset{l}{\otimes} A) & & \xrightarrow{(T_\rho)_{13}} & & {}_{(s\otimes 1)}(A \underset{s}{\otimes} A) \otimes_t A \end{array} \tag{2.7}$$

where $(T_\rho)_{13} = (\Sigma \otimes \iota)(\iota \otimes T_\rho)(\Sigma \otimes \iota)$. Conversely, each pair of maps (T_λ, T_ρ) as in (2.3) that satisfy (2.5) and make the diagrams (2.6) and (2.7) commute define a left comultiplication Δ_B via (2.4).

A *left counit* for a left multiplier bialgebroid as above is map ${}_B\varepsilon \in \mathrm{Hom}({}_sA, {}_BB) \cap \mathrm{Hom}({}_tA, B_B)$ that makes the following diagrams commute,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \underset{s}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{T_\rho} & A \underset{l}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle m}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle B\varepsilon\otimes\iota} \\ A & \longleftarrow & {}_BB \otimes {}_tA \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} A \overset{t}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{T_\lambda} & A \underset{l}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle m\Sigma}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \iota\otimes B\varepsilon} \\ A & \longleftarrow & {}_sA \otimes B_B \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccccc} A \underset{s}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{m} & A & \xleftarrow{m} & A \underset{t}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle \iota\otimes B\varepsilon}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle B\varepsilon} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \iota\otimes B\varepsilon} \\ A & \xrightarrow{B\varepsilon} & B, & \xleftarrow{B\varepsilon} & A \end{array} \tag{2.8}$$

where the lower horizontal maps from ${}_BB \otimes {}_tA$, ${}_sA \otimes B_B$, $A_t \otimes B_B$ and $A_t \otimes B_B$ to A are given by $y \otimes a \mapsto t(y)a$, $a \otimes x \mapsto s(x)a$, $a \otimes x \mapsto as(x)$ and $a \otimes y \mapsto at(y)$, respectively, and m denotes the multiplication map $a \otimes b \mapsto ab$.

2.2. **Right multiplier bialgebroids.** The notion of a right multiplier bialgebroid is opposite to the notion of a left multiplier bialgebroid in the sense that in all assumptions, left and right multiplication are reversed.

Accordingly, a *right quantum graph* is a tuple $\mathcal{A}_C = (C, A, s, t)$, where (1) C and A are algebras and ${}_AA$ is non-degenerate as a left A-module, (2) $s\colon C \to M(A)$ is a homomorphism and $t\colon C \to M(A)$ is an anti-homomorphism such that their images commute, (3) the C-modules A_s and A_t are faithful, non-degenerate and idempotent, and (4a) the A-module ${}_AA$ has local units in A or (4b) the C-modules A_s and A_t are flat. As before, we write ${}_sA$, A_t, ${}_tA$ or A_s when we regard A as a left or right C-module via $x \cdot a := s(x)a$, $y \cdot a := at(y)$, $a \cdot x := as(x)$ or $a \cdot y := t(y)a$, respectively.

Given such a right quantum graph $\mathcal{A}_C = (C, A, s, t)$, we denote by $A \underset{r}{\otimes} A := A_t \otimes A_s$ the tensor product of B-modules, regard this as a left $M(A) \otimes M(A)$-module, and denote by $R_{\mathrm{reg}}(A \times_C A) \subseteq \mathrm{End}(A \underset{r}{\otimes} A)^{\mathrm{op}}$ the subalgebra consisting of all maps v such that $(1 \otimes b)_\lambda v(a) = v(a \otimes b) = (a \otimes 1)_\rho v(b)$ for some well-defined maps ${}_\lambda v, {}_\rho v\colon A \to A \underset{r}{\otimes} A$ and all $a, b \in A$. A *right comultiplication* for the right quantum graph $\mathcal{A}_C$ is a homomorphism

$\Delta_C\colon A \to R_{\mathrm{reg}}(A \times_C A)$ satisfying

$$\Delta_C(t(x)s(y)at(x')s(y')) = (s(y)\otimes t(x))\Delta_C(a)(s(y')\otimes t(x')) \tag{2.9}$$

$$(a\otimes 1\otimes 1)((\Delta_C\otimes\iota)((1\otimes c)\Delta_C(b))) = (1\otimes 1\otimes c)((\iota\otimes\Delta_C)((a\otimes 1)\Delta_C(b))) \tag{2.10}$$

for all $a,b,c \in A$ and $x,x',y,y' \in C$. A *right multiplier bialgebroid* is a right quantum graph with a right comultiplication. Associated to such a right comultiplication are the *canonical maps*

$$ {}_\lambda T\colon A \underset{t}{\otimes} A \to A \underset{r}{\otimes} A, \qquad {}_\rho T\colon A \overset{s}{\otimes} A \to A \underset{r}{\otimes} A, \tag{2.11}$$

$$ {}_\lambda T(a\otimes b) = (a\otimes 1)\Delta_C(b), \qquad {}_\rho T(a\otimes b) = (1\otimes b)\Delta_C(a), \tag{2.12}$$

where $A \underset{t}{\otimes} A = A_t \otimes {}_tA$ and $A \overset{s}{\otimes} A = {}_sA \otimes A_s$. These maps satisfy analogues of the relations (2.5) and make similar diagrams to those in (2.6) and (2.7) commute. Conversely, each pair of maps $({}_\lambda T, {}_\rho T)$ as in (2.11) that satisfy the analogues of (2.5), (2.6) and (2.7) define a right comultiplication Δ_C via (2.12).

A *right counit* for a right multiplier bialgebroid $(\mathcal{A}_C, \Delta_C)$ is a map $\varepsilon_C \in \mathrm{Hom}(A_s, C_C) \cap \mathrm{Hom}(A_t, {}_CC)$ that makes the following diagrams commute,

(2.13)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \overset{t}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{\rho T} & A \underset{r}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle m\Sigma}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varepsilon_C\otimes\iota} \\ A & \longleftarrow & {}_CC \otimes A_s \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} A \underset{s}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{\lambda T} & A \underset{r}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle m}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \iota\otimes\varepsilon_C} \\ A & \longleftarrow & A_t \otimes C_C \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccccc} A \underset{s}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{m} & A & \xleftarrow{m} & A \underset{t}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle \varepsilon_C\otimes\iota}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varepsilon_C} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varepsilon_C\otimes\iota} \\ A & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_C} & C, & \xleftarrow{\varepsilon_C} & A \end{array}$$

where the lower horizontal maps to A are the natural ones.

2.3. **Regular multiplier Hopf algebroids.** A left and a right quantum graph $\mathcal{A}_B = (B, A, s_B, t_B)$ and $\mathcal{A}_C = (C, A, s_C, t_C)$ are *compatible* if the underlying algebra A is the same and the relations $t_B(B) = s_C(C)$ and $t_C(C) = s_B(B)$ hold. In that case, we identify B and C with their images $s_B(B)$ and $s_C(C)$ in $M(A)$, so that the maps t_B and t_C get identified with the anti-isomorphisms $S_B := t_B \circ s_B^{-1}\colon B \to C$ and $S_C := t_C \circ s_C^{-1}\colon C \to B$, respectively. Thus, compatible left and right quantum graphs are given by a non-degenerate algebra A and subalgebras $B, C \subseteq M(A)$ such that A is idempotent (and automatically non-degenerate and faithful) as a left and as a right module over B and over C, and such that the assumptions (4a) or (4b) above concerning local units or flatness hold.

A *multiplier bialgebroid* consists of a left multiplier bialgebroid $(\mathcal{A}_B, \Delta_B)$ and a right multiplier bialgebroid $(\mathcal{A}_C, \Delta_C)$, where $\mathcal{A}_B$ and $\mathcal{A}_C$ are compatible and

$$\begin{aligned} &((\Delta_B\otimes\iota)((1\otimes c)\Delta_C(b)))(a\otimes 1\otimes 1) = (1\otimes 1\otimes c)((\iota\otimes\Delta_C)(\Delta_B(b)(a\otimes 1))), \\ &(a\otimes 1\otimes 1)((\Delta_C\otimes\iota)(\Delta_B(b)(1\otimes c))) = ((\iota\otimes\Delta_B)((a\otimes 1)\Delta_C(b)))(1\otimes 1\otimes c) \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

for all $a, b, c \in A$ or, equivalently, the following diagrams commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \underset{C}{\otimes} A \underset{B}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{\iota\otimes T_\rho} & A \underset{C}{\otimes} A \underset{l}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle {}_\lambda T\otimes\iota}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle {}_\lambda T\otimes\iota} \\ A \underset{r}{\otimes} A \underset{B}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{\iota\otimes T_\rho} & A \underset{r}{\otimes} A \underset{l}{\otimes} A, \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} A \overset{C}{\otimes} A \overset{B}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{\iota\otimes_\rho T} & A \overset{C}{\otimes} A \underset{r}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle T_\lambda\otimes\iota}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle T_\lambda\otimes\iota} \\ A \underset{l}{\otimes} A \overset{B}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{\iota\otimes_\rho T} & A \underset{l}{\otimes} A \underset{r}{\otimes} A. \end{array} \tag{2.15}$$

We call $\mathcal{A} := ((\mathcal{A}_B, \Delta_B), (\mathcal{A}_C, \Delta_C))$ a *regular multiplier Hopf algebroid* if the canonical maps $T_\lambda, T_\rho, {}_\lambda T, {}_\rho T$ are bijective. The main result of [40] says that this condition is equivalent to existence of an invertible antipode, which is an anti-homomorphism $S\colon A \to A$ satisfying the following conditions:

(1) $S(xyax'y') = S_C(y')S_B(x')S(a)S_C(y)S_B(x)$ for all $x, x' \in B, y, y' \in C, a \in A$;
(2) there exist a left counit ${}_B\varepsilon$ for $(\mathcal{A}_B, \Delta_B)$ and a right counit ε_C for $(\mathcal{A}_C, \Delta_C)$ such that the following diagrams commute,

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A \underset{B}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{T_\rho} & A \underset{l}{\otimes} A & & \\ {\scriptstyle S_C\circ\varepsilon_C\otimes\iota}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle S\otimes\iota} & & \\ B_B \otimes {}_BA & \twoheadrightarrow A \twoheadleftarrow & M(A) \underset{C}{\otimes} A & & \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccccc} A \underset{C}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{{}_\lambda T} & A \underset{r}{\otimes} A & & \\ {\scriptstyle \iota\otimes S_B\circ{}_B\varepsilon}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \iota\otimes S} & & \\ A_C \otimes {}_CC & \twoheadrightarrow A \twoheadleftarrow & A \underset{B}{\otimes} M(A) & & \end{array} \tag{2.16}$$

where the lower horizontal maps are given by multiplication.

The counits ${}_B\varepsilon$ and ε_C then are uniquely determined.

The canonical maps $T_\lambda, T_\rho, {}_\lambda T, {}_\rho T$ and the antipode S of a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ as above are related by the following commutative diagrams,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \overset{B}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{\iota\otimes S} & A \underset{l}{\otimes} A, \\ {\scriptstyle {}_\rho T}\downarrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle T_\rho} \\ A \underset{r}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow[\iota\otimes S]{} & A \underset{B}{\otimes} A \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} A \overset{C}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{S\otimes\iota} & A \underset{r}{\otimes} A, \\ {\scriptstyle T_\lambda}\downarrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle {}_\lambda T} \\ A \underset{l}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow[S\otimes\iota]{} & A \underset{C}{\otimes} A \end{array} \tag{2.17}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \underset{C}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{(S\otimes\iota)\circ\Sigma} & A \underset{r}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle {}_\lambda T}\downarrow & \searrow^{T_\lambda\circ\Sigma} \quad \swarrow_{T_\rho\circ\Sigma} & \uparrow{\scriptstyle {}_\rho T} \\ A \underset{r}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow[(S\otimes\iota)\circ\Sigma]{} & A \overset{B}{\otimes} A \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} A \underset{B}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{(\iota\otimes S)\circ\Sigma} & A \underset{l}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle T_\rho}\downarrow & \searrow^{{}_\rho T\circ\Sigma} \quad \swarrow_{{}_\lambda T\circ\Sigma} & \uparrow{\scriptstyle T_\lambda} \\ A \underset{l}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow[(\iota\otimes S)\circ\Sigma]{} & A \overset{C}{\otimes} A \end{array} \tag{2.18}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \overset{C}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{\Sigma\circ(S\otimes S)} & A \overset{B}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle T_\lambda}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle {}_\rho T} \\ A \underset{l}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow[\Sigma\circ(S\otimes S)]{} & A \underset{r}{\otimes} A, \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} A \underset{C}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{\Sigma\circ(S\otimes S)} & A \underset{B}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle {}_\lambda T}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle T_\rho} \\ A \underset{r}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow[\Sigma\circ(S\otimes S)]{} & A \underset{l}{\otimes} A, \end{array} \tag{2.19}$$

see Theorem 6.8, Proposition 6.11 and Proposition 6.12 in [40].

Let $\mathcal{A}_B = (B, A, \iota, S_B)$ and $\mathcal{A}_C = (C, A, \iota, S_C)$ be compatible left and right quantum graphs. An involution $*$ on A is *admissible with respect to* $\mathcal{A}_B$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_C$ if (1) B and C are *-subalgebras of $M(A)$ and (2) $S_B \circ * \circ S_C \circ * = \iota_C$ and $S_C \circ * \circ S_B \circ * = \iota_B$. A *multiplier *-bialgebroid/multiplier Hopf *-algebroid* is a multiplier bialgebroid/regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A} = ((\mathcal{A}_B, \Delta_B), (\mathcal{A}_C, \Delta_C))$ with an admissible involution on the underlying algebra A satisfying $(* \otimes *) \circ \Delta_B \circ * = \Delta_C$. In that case, the left and right counits ${}_B\varepsilon, \varepsilon_C$ and the antipode S satisfy

$$\varepsilon_C \circ * = * \circ S_B \circ {}_B\varepsilon, \qquad {}_B\varepsilon \circ * = * \circ S_C \circ \varepsilon_C, \qquad S \circ * \circ S \circ * = \iota_A. \tag{2.20}$$

We end this review with a few observations and definitions not contained in [40].

2.3.1. **Lemma.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with antipode S and left and right counits ${}_B\varepsilon$ and ε_C, respectively. Then $\varepsilon_C \circ S = S \circ {}_B\varepsilon$ and ${}_B\varepsilon \circ S = S \circ \varepsilon_C$.*

Proof. Essentially, this follows from the fact that S is an anti-isomorphism of $\mathcal{A}$ with its bi-opposite. More explicitly, the outer, upper, left and right cells of the diagram



commute, whence the lower cell commutes as well, whence $\varepsilon_C \circ S = S \circ {}_B\varepsilon$, and the second relation follows similarly. □

In our study of integration, we will make use of the following conditions.

2.3.2. **Definition.** *We call a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$* projective *or* flat *if all of the modules ${}_BA, A_B, {}_CA, A_C$ are projective or flat, respectively.*

Using the antipode, one easily verifies that the module ${}_BA$ or A_B is projective/flat if and only if A_C or ${}_CA$ is projective/flat, respectively.

We next show that the counits of a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid can be assumed to be surjective without much loss of generality. Denote by ${}_BA^\vee, A_B^\vee, {}_CA^\vee, A_C^\vee$ the dual modules of ${}_BA, A_B, {}_CA, A_C$, respectively; for example, ${}_BA^\vee = \mathrm{Hom}({}_BA, {}_BB)$ and $A_B^\vee = \mathrm{Hom}(A_B, B_B)$.

2.3.3. **Proposition.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a flat regular multiplier Hopf algebroid. Then*

(1) *$B_0 := {}_B\varepsilon(A) \subseteq B$ and $C_0 := \varepsilon_C(A) \subseteq C$ are two-sided ideals and satisfy*
$$\sum_{\omega \in A_B^\vee} \omega(A) = B_0 = \sum_{\omega \in {}_BA^\vee} \omega(A), \qquad \sum_{\omega \in A_C^\vee} \omega(A) = C_0 = \sum_{\omega \in A_C^\vee} \omega(A).$$
(2) *S_B and S_C restrict to anti-isomorphisms $S_{B_0} \colon B_0 \to C_0$ and $S_{C_0} \colon C_0 \to B_0$;*
(3) *$\mathcal{A}_{B_0} := (A, B_0, \iota_{B_0}, S_{B_0})$ and $\mathcal{A}_{C_0} := (A, C_0, \iota_{C_0}, S_{C_0})$ are compatible left and right quantum graphs;*
(4) *the natural maps ${}_{B_0}A \otimes_{S(B_0)} A \to A \underset{l}{\otimes} A$ and $A_{S(C_0)} \otimes A_{C_0} \to A \underset{r}{\otimes} A$ are isomorphisms so that Δ_B and Δ_C can be regarded as a left and a right comultiplication for $\mathcal{A}_{B_0}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{C_0}$, respectively;*

(5) $\mathcal{A}_0 := ((\mathcal{A}_{B_0}, \Delta_B), (\mathcal{A}_{C_0}, \Delta_C))$ *is a flat regular multiplier Hopf algebroid.*

Proof. (1) By Lemma 4.4 in [40], $B_0 \subseteq B$ is a two-sided ideal and equal to $\sum \omega(A)$, where the sum is taken over all $\omega \in {}_B A^\vee$ or over all $\omega \in \mathrm{Hom}({}_{S(B)}A, B_B)$. Since $\mathrm{Hom}({}_{S(B)}A, B_B) = \{\omega \circ S^{-1} : \omega \in A^\vee_B\}$, the equations involving B_0 follow. The assertions concerning C_0 follow similarly.

(2) Immediate from Lemma 2.3.1.

(3) By Lemma 4.4 in [40], $A = B_0 A = S_B(B_0)A = C_0 A$. Using the antipode, one finds that $A = AB_0 = AC_0$. Since A is non-degenerate as an algebra, we can conclude from these relations that it is also non-degenerate as a left module and as a right module over both B_0 and C_0, respectively. Since every idempotent B_0-module also is a B-module and ${}_B A$ is flat as a B-module, ${}_{B_0}A$ must be flat as a B_0-module. Likewise, the modules ${}_{C_0}A$, A_{B_0} and A_{C_0} are flat.

(4) This follows easily from the relation $B_0 A = A = S_B(B_0)A$ and the fact that $B_0 \subseteq B$ is a two-sided ideal.

(5) Immediate from (1)–(4). □

3. Integration

This section introduces left and right integrals on multiplier bialgebroids and establishes the key properties of such integrals.

As outlined in the introduction, integration on a multiplier bialgebroid involves maps from A to B and C that are left- or right-invariant and correspond to fiberwise integration, and functionals on B and C which then yield "total" integrals on A by composition.

We first formulate the appropriate left- and right-invariance for maps from A to B and C (Subsection 3.1). In the setting of Hopf algebroids, such invariant maps were studied already in [1]. We then fix functionals on B and C and introduce several compatibility conditions on these functionals and the invariant maps on A that seem necessary to obtain a good integration theory (Subsection 3.2). Using these conditions and following the work of Van Daele on multiplier Hopf algebras [43], we establish uniqueness of integrals up to scaling (Subsection 3.3) and existence of modular elements (Subsection 3.5). As a tool, we use natural convolution operators which in Section 4 reappear in the definition of the dual algebra of the dual multiplier Hopf algebroid.

3.1. **Invariant elements of dual modules.** Let $\mathcal{A} = ((\mathcal{A}_B, \Delta_B), (\mathcal{A}_C, \Delta_C))$ be a multiplier bialgebroid. We use the notation introduced in Section 2. Regarding A as a module over B and C, one obtains four associated dual modules, and we abbreviate

$$
\begin{aligned}
{}_B A^\vee &:= \mathrm{Hom}({}_B A, {}_B B), \qquad & A^\vee_B &:= \mathrm{Hom}(A_B, B_B), \qquad & {}_B A^\vee_B &:= {}_B A^\vee \cap A^\vee_B,\\
{}_C A^\vee &:= \mathrm{Hom}({}_C A, {}_C B), \qquad & A^\vee_C &:= \mathrm{Hom}(A_C, C_C), \qquad & {}_C A^\vee_C &:= {}_C A^\vee \cap A^\vee_C.
\end{aligned}
$$

3.1.1. **Definition.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a multiplier bialgebroid. We call*

(1) ${}_C\phi \in {}_C A^\vee$ left-invariant (w.r.t. Δ_B) *if* $(\iota \otimes S_B^{-1} \circ {}_C\phi)(\Delta_B(b)(a \otimes 1)) = {}_C\phi(b)a$,

(2) $\phi_C \in A^\vee_C$ left-invariant (w.r.t. Δ_C) *if* $(\iota \otimes \phi_C)((a \otimes 1)\Delta_C(b)) = a\phi_C(b)$,

(3) ${}_B\psi \in {}_B A^\vee$ right-invariant (w.r.t. Δ_B) *if* $({}_B\psi \otimes \iota)(\Delta_B(a)(1 \otimes b)) = {}_B\psi(a)b$,

(4) $\psi_B \in A^\vee_B$ right-invariant (w.r.t. Δ_C) *if* $(S_C^{-1} \circ \psi_B \otimes \iota)((1 \otimes b)\Delta_C(a)) = b\psi_B(a)$

for all $a, b \in A$. We denote by ${}^{\Delta_B}({}_C A^\vee)$, ${}^{\Delta_C}(A^\vee_C)$, $({}_B A^\vee)^{\Delta_B}$ and $(A^\vee_B)^{\Delta_C}$ the spaces consisting of all maps as in (1)–(4), respectively.

The purpose of the lower subscripts on ϕ and ψ will become clearer in the next subsection.

Regard ${}_C A^\vee_C$ as an $M(B)$-bimodule and ${}_B A^\vee_B$ as an $M(C)$-bimodule, where $(x \cdot {}_C\phi_C \cdot x')(a) = {}_C\phi_C(x'ax)$ and $(y \cdot {}_B\psi_B \cdot y')(a) = {}_B\psi_B(y'ay)$.

3.1.2. **Proposition.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a multiplier bialgebroid. Then ${}^{\Delta_B}({}_C A^\vee)$ and ${}^{\Delta_C}(A^\vee_C)$ are $M(B)$-sub-bimodules of ${}_C A^\vee_C$, and $({}_B A^\vee)^{\Delta_B}$ and $(A^\vee_B)^{\Delta_C}$ are $M(C)$-sub-bimodules of ${}_B A^\vee_B$.*

Proof. In Sweedler notation, the conditions in (1)–(4) in Definition 3.1.1 take the form

$$\sum S_B^{-1}({}_C\phi(b_{(2)}))b_{(1)}a = {}_C\phi(b)a, \qquad \sum ab_{(1)}S_C(\phi_C(b_{(2)})) = a\phi_C(b), \tag{3.1}$$

$$\sum ba_{(2)}S_C^{-1}(\psi_B(a_{(1)})) = b\psi_B(a), \qquad \sum S_B({}_B\psi(a_{(1)}))a_{(2)}b = {}_B\psi(a)b. \tag{3.2}$$

The assertions then follow easily from the relations (2.1) and (2.9), for example,

$$\begin{aligned} {}_C\phi(by)a &= \sum S_B^{-1}({}_C\phi(b_{(2)}))b_{(1)}ya = {}_C\phi(b)ya, \\ {}_C\phi(x'bx)a &= \sum S_B^{-1}({}_C\phi(x'b_{(2)}x))b_{(1)}a \end{aligned}$$

for all $a, b \in A$, $y \in M(C)$, $x, x' \in M(B)$ and ${}_C\phi \in {}^{\Delta_B}({}_C A^\vee)$. □

To stress that left-invariant maps $A \to C$ and right-invariant maps $A \to B$ are morphisms of bimodules, we shall use double subscripts from now on and write ${}_C\phi_C$ or ${}_B\psi_B$ instead of ${}_C\phi, \phi_C, {}_B\psi$ or ψ_B, respectively.

If $\mathcal{A}$ is a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid, then left or right invariance with respect to Δ_B is equivalent to left or right invariance with respect to Δ_C and to certain strong invariance relations, just as in the case of Hopf algebroids; see Scholium 2.10 in [1]. We include the proof, which uses the following observation. In terms of the canonical maps of the multiplier bialgebroid $\mathcal{A}$, the invariance conditions (1)–(4) in Definition 3.1.1 amount to commutativity of the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \underset{C}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{T_\lambda} & A \underset{l}{\otimes} A \\ & {\scriptstyle \iota\otimes_C\phi_C}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle \iota\otimes S_B^{-1}\circ_C\phi_C} & \\ & A, & \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} A \underset{C}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{{}_\lambda T} & A \underset{r}{\otimes} A \\ & {\scriptstyle \iota\otimes_C\phi_C}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle \iota\otimes_C\phi_C} & \\ & A, & \end{array} \tag{3.3}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \underset{B}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{T_\rho} & A \underset{l}{\otimes} A \\ & {\scriptstyle {}_B\psi_B\otimes\iota}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle {}_B\psi_B\otimes\iota} & \\ & A, & \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} A \underset{B}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{T_\rho} & A \underset{r}{\otimes} A \\ & {\scriptstyle {}_B\psi_B\otimes\iota}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle S_C^{-1}\circ_B\psi_B\otimes\iota} & \\ & A, & \end{array} \tag{3.4}$$

where ${}_C\phi_C \in {}_C A^\vee_C$ and ${}_B\psi_B \in {}_B A^\vee_B$, respectively.

3.1.3. **Proposition.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with antipode S. Then*

(1) ${}^{\Delta_B}({}_C A^\vee) = {}^{\Delta_C}(A^\vee_C) = \{{}_C\phi_C \in {}_C A^\vee_C \mid$ *diagram* (3.5) *commutes*$\}$;

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \underset{B}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{T_\rho} & A \underset{l}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle {}_\rho T\Sigma}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle S\circ(\iota\otimes S_B^{-1}\circ_C\phi_C)} \\ A \underset{r}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow[\iota\otimes_C\phi_C]{} & A; \end{array} \tag{3.5}$$

(2) $({}_B A^\vee)^{\Delta_B} = (A^\vee_B)^{\Delta_C} = \{{}_B\psi_B \in {}_B A^\vee_B \mid$ *diagram* (3.6) *commutes*$\}$;

(3.6)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \underset{C}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{{}_\lambda T} & A \underset{r}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle T_\lambda \Sigma}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle S\circ(S_C^{-1}\circ_B \psi_B \otimes \iota)} \\ A \underset{l}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow[{}_B\psi_B\otimes\iota]{} & A. \end{array}$$

(3) *The maps* ${}_C\phi_C \mapsto S^{-1}\circ {}_C\phi_C \circ S$ *and* ${}_B\psi_B \mapsto S^{-1}\circ {}_B\psi_B \circ S$ *are bijections between the sets in (1) and (2).*

Proof. We first prove (2), and assertion (1) follows similarly. Let ${}_B\psi_B \in {}_B A^\vee_B$ and consider following diagram:



The large rectangle commutes by (2.17), and the upper and lower cells commute by inspection. Since all horizontal and vertical arrows are bijections, the triangle on the left hand side commutes if and only if the triangle on the right hand side does.

Next, consider the following diagram:



The upper left cell commutes by (2.18), and the lower cell commutes by inspection. Since $T_\rho, T_\lambda, {}_\lambda T$ and S are isomorphisms, the outer cell commutes if and only if the triangle on the right commutes.

We next prove the assertion on the second map in (3); the case of the first map is treated similarly. Let ${}_B\psi_B \in {}_B A^\vee_B$ again and consider following diagram:



The large rectangle commutes by (2.19), and the upper and lower cell by inspection. Therefore, the triangle on the left hand side commutes if and only if the triangle on the right hand side does. □

3.1.4. **Remark.** In Sweedler notation, commutativity of the diagrams (3.5) and (3.6) amounts to the relations

$$\sum S(a_{(1)})\,{}_C\phi_C(a_{(2)}b) = b_{(1)}S_C({}_C\phi_C(ab_{(2)})),$$
$$\sum {}_B\psi_B(ba_{(1)})S(a_{(2)}) = S_B({}_B\psi_B(b_{(1)}a))b_{(2)}.$$

3.2. **Base weights and adapted integrals.** Let $\mathcal{A}$ be regular multiplier Hopf algebroid. To obtain from left- or right-invariant maps ${}_C\phi_C\colon A \to C$ or ${}_B\psi_B\colon A \to B$ scalar-valued integrals ϕ or ψ on A, we compose the former with suitable functionals μ_B and μ_C on the base algebras B and C, respectively. We first formulate our assumptions on the functionals μ_B and μ_C, and then define the notion of a left and of a right integral.

Throughout this section, let $\mathcal{A} = ((A_B, \Delta_B), (\mathcal{A}_C, \Delta_C))$ be a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid.

3.2.1. **Definition.** *A* base weight *for a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ is a pair of faithful functionals $\mu_B \in B^\vee$ and $\mu_C \in C^\vee$ satisfying $\mu_B \circ S_C = \mu_C$, $\mu_C \circ S_B = \mu_B$ and $\mu_B \circ {}_B\varepsilon = \mu_C \circ \varepsilon_C$, where ${}_B\varepsilon$ and ε_C denote the left and the right counit of $\mathcal{A}$, respectively.*

3.2.2. **Remark.** If $\mathcal{A}$ is a multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid, we shall usually assume that μ_B and μ_C are positive in the sense that they coincide with $\mu_B^* := * \circ \mu_B \circ *$ and $\mu_C^* := * \circ \mu_C \circ *$, respectively, and satisfy $\mu_B(x^*x) \geq 0$ and $\mu_C(y^*y) \geq 0$ for all $x \in B$, $y \in C$.

The functionals comprising a base weight automatically have modular automorphisms, given by the square of the antipode or its inverse.

3.2.3. **Proposition.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with base weight $\mu = (\mu_B, \mu_C)$. Then μ_B and μ_C have modular automorphisms, given by $\sigma_B^\mu := S_B^{-1} \circ S_C^{-1}$ and $\sigma_C^\mu := S_B \circ S_C$, respectively.*

Proof. We only prove the assertion concerning σ_B^μ. For all $x \in B$, $a \in A$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_B(x\,{}_B\varepsilon(a)) = \mu_B({}_B\varepsilon(xa)) &= \mu_C(\varepsilon_C(xa))\\ &= \mu_C(\varepsilon_C(S_C^{-1}(x)a))\\ &= \mu_B({}_B\varepsilon(S_C^{-1}(x)a)) = \mu_B({}_B\varepsilon(a)S_B^{-1}(S_C^{-1}(x))).\end{aligned}$$ □

3.2.4. **Remark.** In the setting of weak multiplier Hopf algebras, the base algebras B and C carry canonical functionals μ_B and μ_C which satisfy the assumptions in Definition 3.2.1, see Proposition 4.8 in [44].

3.2.5. **Remark.** The preceding result fits with the theory of measured quantum groupoids, where the square of the antipode generates the scaling group and the latter restricts to the modular automorphism groups on the base algebras, that is, in the notation of [17], $S^2 = \tau_i$ and $\tau_t \circ \alpha = \alpha \circ \sigma_t^\nu$, $\tau_t \circ \beta = \beta \circ \sigma^\nu$.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with base weight $\mu = (\mu_B, \mu_C)$. Assume that a functional $\omega \in A^\vee$ and maps ${}_B\omega, \omega_B\colon A \to B$ and ${}_C\omega, \omega_C\colon A \to C$ are given.

Then

$$(3.7)\quad \omega = \mu_B \circ {}_B\omega,\quad {}_B\omega \in {}_BA^\vee \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \omega(xa) = \mu_B(x\,{}_B\omega(a)) \quad \text{for all } x \in B, a \in A,$$

$$(3.8)\quad \omega = \mu_B \circ \omega_B,\quad \omega_B \in A_B^\vee \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \omega(ax) = \mu_B(\omega_B(a)x) \quad \text{for all } x \in B, a \in A,$$

$$(3.9)\quad \omega = \mu_C \circ {}_C\omega,\quad {}_C\omega \in {}_CA^\vee \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \omega(ya) = \mu_C(y\,{}_C\omega(a)) \quad \text{for all } y \in C, a \in A,$$

$$(3.10)\quad \omega = \mu_C \circ \omega_C,\quad \omega_C \in A_C^\vee \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \omega(ay) = \mu_C(\omega_C(a)y) \quad \text{for all } y \in C, a \in A.$$

The verification is straightforward and uses the relations $A = BA = AB = CA = AC$ and the fact that μ_B and μ_C are faithful. Since μ_B and μ_C are faithful, maps ${}_B\omega, \omega_B, {}_C\omega$ or ω_C satisfying the equivalent conditions in (3.7), (3.8), (3.9) or (3.10), respectively, are uniquely determined by ω if they exist.

3.2.6. **Definition.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with base weight $\mu = (\mu_B, \mu_C)$. A functional $\omega \in A^\vee$ is* adapted to μ *if there exist maps ${}_B\omega, \omega_B \colon A \to B$ and ${}_C\omega, \omega_C \colon A \to C$ such that the equivalent conditions in* (3.7)–(3.10) *hold. We denote by ${}_\mu A_\mu^\vee \subseteq A^\vee$ the subspace of all functionals adapted to μ.*

3.2.7. **Remark.** In the setting of weak multiplier Hopf algebras, every functional on the total algebra is adapted to the canonical functionals μ_B and μ_C on the base algebras in the sense above. This follows from Proposition 3.3 in [3] and the comments thereafter.

The definition above can be rephrased as follows. Composing maps from A to B or C with μ_B or μ_C, respectively, we obtain push-forward maps

$$(3.11)\qquad (\mu_B)_* \colon {}_BA^\vee, A_B^\vee \to A^\vee \qquad \text{and} \qquad (\mu_C)_* \colon {}_CA^\vee, A_C^\vee \to A^\vee,$$

and ${}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$ is the intersection of the images of these four maps.

By assumption, the left and right counits of $\mathcal{A}$ yield a counit functional $\varepsilon \in {}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$:

3.2.8. **Example.** Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with base weight $\mu = (\mu_B, \mu_C)$ and left and right counits ${}_B\varepsilon$ and ε_C, respectively. Then the functional $\varepsilon := \mu_B \circ {}_B\varepsilon = \mu_C \circ \varepsilon_C$ lies in ${}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$ and the associated maps ε_B and ${}_C\varepsilon$ are given by $\varepsilon_B = S_C \circ \varepsilon_C$ and ${}_C\varepsilon = S_B \circ {}_B\varepsilon$, respectively, because

$$\varepsilon(ax) = \mu_C(\varepsilon_C(ax)) = \mu_C(S_C^{-1}(x)\varepsilon_C(a)) = \mu_B(S_C(\varepsilon_C(a))x),$$
$$\varepsilon(ya) = \mu_B({}_B\varepsilon(ya)) = \mu_B({}_B\varepsilon(a)S_B^{-1}(y)) = \mu_C(yS_B({}_B\varepsilon(a)))$$

for all $x \in B$, $y \in C$, $a \in A$. Moreover, $\varepsilon \circ S = \varepsilon$ by Lemma 2.3.1.

We can now define left and right integrals adapted to a base weight. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with base weight μ as before, and let $\phi, \psi \in {}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$. By Proposition 3.1.3, the following implications hold:

$$(3.12)\quad {}_C\phi \text{ is left-invariant} \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \phi_C \text{ is left-invariant} \quad\Rightarrow\quad \phi_C = {}_C\phi \in {}_CA_C^\vee$$

$$(3.13)\quad {}_B\psi \text{ is right-invariant} \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \psi_B \text{ is right-invariant} \quad\Rightarrow\quad {}_B\psi = \psi_B \in {}_BA_B^\vee.$$

For example, if ${}_C\phi$ is left-invariant, then ${}_C\phi \in A_C^\vee$ and hence ${}_C\phi = \phi_C$.

3.2.9. **Definition.** *A* left (right) integral *on a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ is a $\phi \in {}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$ (or $\psi \in {}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$) satisfying the equivalent conditions in* (3.12) *(or* (3.13)*, respectively).*

Like invariant elements, left and right integrals form bimodules over B or C, respectively, and stand in a bijective correspondence via the antipode. The proof uses the following result.

3.2.10. **Lemma.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with base weight μ and let $\omega \in {}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$.*

(1) *Let $x, x' \in M(B)$, $y, y' \in M(C)$ and $\omega' := xy \cdot \omega \cdot x'y'$. Then $\omega' \in {}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$ and*

$$\begin{aligned} {}_B\omega'(a) &= {}_B\omega(y'axy)\sigma_B^\mu(x'), & \omega'_B(a) &= (\sigma_B^\mu)^{-1}(x)\omega_B(x'y'ay), \\ {}_C\omega'(a) &= {}_C\omega(x'axy)\sigma_C^\mu(y'), & \omega'_C(a) &= (\sigma_C^\mu)^{-1}(y)\omega_C(x'y'ax) \end{aligned}$$

for all $a \in A$.

(2) *The compositions $\omega \circ S$ and $\omega \circ S^{-1}$ lie in ${}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$,*

$$\begin{aligned} {}_B(\omega \circ S) &= S_B^{-1} \circ \omega_C \circ S, & (\omega \circ S)_B &= S_B^{-1} \circ {}_C\omega \circ S, \\ {}_C(\omega \circ S) &= S_C^{-1} \circ \omega_B \circ S, & (\omega \circ S)_C &= S_C^{-1} \circ {}_B\omega \circ S, \end{aligned}$$

and the relations still hold if S, S_B^{-1}, S_C^{-1} are replaced by S^{-1}, S_C, S_B, respectively.

(3) *Assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is a multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid and that μ_B and μ_C are self-adjoint. Then the composition $\omega^* := * \circ \omega \circ *$ lies in ${}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$ and*

$$\begin{aligned} {}_B(\omega^*) &= * \circ \omega_B \circ *, & (\omega^*)_B &= * \circ {}_B\omega \circ *, \\ {}_C(\omega^*) &= * \circ \omega_C \circ *, & (\omega^*)_C &= * \circ {}_C\omega \circ *. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The verification consists of straightforward calculations, for example,

$$\begin{aligned} (xy \cdot \omega \cdot x'y')(x''a) &= \mu_B({}_B\omega(x'y'x''axy)) = \mu_B(x''{}_B\omega(y'axy)\sigma_B^\mu(x')), \\ (\omega \circ S)(x''a) &= \omega(S(a)S_B(x'')) = \mu_C(\omega_C(S(a))S_B(x'')) = \mu_B(x''S_B^{-1}(\omega_C(S(a)))) \end{aligned}$$

for all a, x, y, x', y' as in (1) and $x'' \in B$. □

3.2.11. **Proposition.** *All left (right) integrals on a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ form an $M(B)$-sub-bimodule ($M(C)$-sub-bimodule) of ${}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$.*

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 3.2.10 and Proposition 3.1.2. □

3.2.12. **Proposition.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with base weight μ. Then the maps $\phi \mapsto \phi \circ S$ and $\psi \mapsto \psi \circ S$ form bijections between all left and all right integrals on $\mathcal{A}$ adapted to μ.*

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 3.2.10 and Proposition 3.1.3. □

3.3. **Uniqueness of integrals.** Left and right integrals on quantum groups are, like the Haar measure of a locally compact group, unique up to scaling. Proposition 3.2.11 shows that in the present context, we can only expect uniqueness up to scaling by multipliers of the base algebras B or C, respectively, and only under a suitable non-degeneracy assumption on the integrals.

The proof involves the following relative tensor products of functionals adapted to base weights. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with base weight $\mu = (\mu_B, \mu_C)$

and let $\upsilon, \omega \in {}_\mu A^\vee_\mu$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \upsilon \circ (\iota \otimes {}_B\omega) = \mu_B \circ (\upsilon_B \otimes {}_B\omega) = \omega \circ (\upsilon_B \otimes \iota) \qquad & \text{in } (A \underset{B}{\otimes} A)^\vee, \\ \upsilon \circ (\iota \otimes \omega_B) = \mu_B \circ ({}_B\upsilon \otimes \omega_B) = \omega \circ ({}_B\upsilon \otimes \iota) \qquad & \text{in } (A \overset{B}{\otimes} A)^\vee, \\ \upsilon \circ (\iota \otimes S_B^{-1} \circ {}_C\omega) = \mu_B \circ ({}_B\upsilon \otimes S_B^{-1} \circ {}_C\omega) = \omega \circ ({}_B\upsilon \otimes \iota) \qquad & \text{in } (A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)^\vee \end{aligned}$$

We denote these compositions by

$$\upsilon \underset{B}{\otimes} \omega \in (A \underset{B}{\otimes} A)^\vee, \qquad \upsilon \overset{B}{\otimes} \omega \in (A \overset{B}{\otimes} A)^\vee, \qquad \upsilon \underset{l}{\otimes} \omega \in (A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)^\vee, \tag{3.14}$$

respectively, and similarly define

$$\upsilon \underset{C}{\otimes} \omega \in (A \underset{C}{\otimes} A)^\vee, \qquad \upsilon \overset{C}{\otimes} \omega \in (A \overset{C}{\otimes} A)^\vee, \qquad \upsilon \underset{r}{\otimes} \omega \in (A \underset{r}{\otimes} A)^\vee. \tag{3.15}$$

The construction of these tensor products can be regarded as a special case of a general bi-categorical construction that is summarised in Appendix A.

3.3.1. **Example.** The left and the right counit of $\mathcal{A}$ satisfy ${}_B\varepsilon(ab) = {}_B\varepsilon(a_B\varepsilon(b))$ and $\varepsilon_C(ab) = \varepsilon_C(\varepsilon_C(a)b)$ by (2.8) and (2.13). Hence, the functional $\varepsilon := \mu_B \circ {}_B\varepsilon = \mu_C \circ \varepsilon_C$ satisfies

$$\varepsilon \circ m_B = \varepsilon \underset{B}{\otimes} \varepsilon, \qquad \varepsilon \circ m_C = \varepsilon \underset{C}{\otimes} \varepsilon, \tag{3.16}$$

where $m_B \colon A \underset{B}{\otimes} A \to A$ and $m_C \colon A \underset{C}{\otimes} A \to A$ denote the multiplication maps.

If ϕ is a left integral on $\mathcal{A}$ adapted to μ, then commutativity of the diagrams (3.3) implies that

$$(\upsilon \underset{l}{\otimes} \phi) \circ T_\lambda = \upsilon \overset{C}{\otimes} \phi, \qquad (\upsilon' \underset{r}{\otimes} \phi) \circ {}_\lambda T = \upsilon' \underset{C}{\otimes} \phi \tag{3.17}$$

for all $\upsilon \in (\mu_C)_*({}_CA^\vee)$, $\upsilon' \in (\mu_C)_*(A^\vee_C)$. Likewise, if ψ is a right integral, then

$$(\psi \underset{l}{\otimes} \omega) \circ T_\rho = \psi \underset{B}{\otimes} \omega, \qquad (\psi \underset{r}{\otimes} \omega') \circ {}_\rho T = \psi \overset{B}{\otimes} \omega' \tag{3.18}$$

for all $\omega \in (\mu_B)_*({}_BA^\vee)$, $\omega' \in (\mu_B)_*(A^\vee_B)$ by commutativity of (3.4).

The first step towards the proof of uniqueness is the following result.

3.3.2. **Proposition.** *Let ϕ be a left and ψ a right integral on a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ. Then $(A_B\phi(A)) \cdot \psi = (A_C\psi(A)) \cdot \phi$ and $\psi \cdot (\phi_B(A)A) = \phi \cdot (\psi_C(A)A)$ as subsets of $A^\vee$.*

Proof. We only prove the first equation. Let $a \in A$ and $b \otimes c \in A \underset{l}{\otimes} A$ and write

$$b \otimes c = \sum_i \Delta_B(d_i)(1 \otimes e_i) = \sum_j \Delta_B(f_j)(g_j \otimes 1)$$

with $d_i, e_i, f_j, g_j \in A$. Then $(\psi \underset{l}{\otimes} \phi)(\Delta_B(a)(b \otimes c))$ is equal to

$$\sum_i (\psi \underset{l}{\otimes} \phi)(\Delta_B(ad_i)(1 \otimes e_i))) = \sum_i (\psi \underset{B}{\otimes} \phi)(ad_i \otimes e_i) = \sum_i \psi(ad_i {}_B\phi(e_i))$$

by (3.17), and to

$$\sum_j (\psi \underset{l}{\otimes} \phi)(\Delta_B(af_j)(g_j \otimes 1))) = \sum_j (\psi \overset{C}{\otimes} \phi)(g_j \otimes af_j) = \sum_j \phi(af_{j\,C}\psi(g_j))$$

by (3.18). Since the maps T_λ and T_ρ are bijective, we can conclude $(A_B\phi(A)) \cdot \psi = (A_C\psi(A)) \cdot \phi$. □

3.3.3. **Corollary.** *Let ϕ and ϕ' be left integrals on a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ. If $A_B\phi'(A) \subseteq A_B\phi(A)$ or ${\phi_B}'(A)A \subseteq \phi_B(A)A$, then*

$$\sum_\psi A_C\psi(A) \cdot \phi' \subseteq \sum_\psi A_C\psi(A) \cdot \phi \qquad \text{or} \qquad \sum_\psi \phi' \cdot \psi_C(A)A \subseteq \sum_\psi \phi \cdot \psi_C(A)A,$$

respectively, where the sums are taken over all right integrals ψ on $\mathcal{A}$ adapted to μ.

Proof. We only consider the first inclusion. If $A_B\phi'(A) \subseteq A_B\phi(A)$, then

$$A_C\psi(A) \cdot \phi' = (A_B\phi'(A)) \cdot \psi \subseteq (A_B\phi(A)) \cdot \psi = A_C\psi(A) \cdot \phi$$

for every right integral ψ by Proposition 3.3.2. □

The preceding result suggests the following non-degeneracy condition for integrals.

3.3.4. **Definition.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ. We call a left integral ϕ (right integral ψ) on $\mathcal{A}$ adapted to μ* full *if ${}_B\phi$ and ϕ_B (${}_C\psi$ and ψ_C, respectively) are surjective. We say $(\mathcal{A}, \mu)$* has full and faithful integrals *if there exists a left or right integral on $\mathcal{A}$ that is full and faithful.*

3.3.5. **Remark.**
(1) If ω is a full left or right integral, then the right or left integrals $\omega \circ S$ and $\omega \circ S^{-1}$ are full again. This follows immediately from Lemma 3.2.10 (2).
(2) Proposition 3.3.2 suggests to relax the condition and define a left integral ϕ to be full if $A_B\phi(A) = A = \phi_B(A)A$. But if the latter condition holds, then $\phi_B(A) = \phi_B(A_B\varepsilon(A)) = \phi_B(A)\,{}_B\varepsilon(A) = {}_B\varepsilon(\phi_B(A)A) = {}_B\varepsilon(A)$ and likewise ${}_B\phi(A) = \varepsilon_B(A) = S({}_C\varepsilon(A))$, and by Proposition 2.3.3, we can assume ${}_B\varepsilon(A) = B = S({}_C\varepsilon(A))$ without much loss of generality.

The results obtained so far can be summarised as follows.

3.3.6. **Theorem.** *Let ω and ω' be left or right integrals on a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ. If ω is full, then $A \cdot \omega' \subseteq A \cdot \omega$ and $\omega' \cdot A \subseteq \omega \cdot A$.*

Proof. If ω is a left and ω' is a right integral, then the assertion follows from Proposition 3.3.2. If both are left integrals and ω is full, then $\omega \circ S$ is a full right integral by Proposition 3.2.12 and Remark 3.3.5, and then the assertion follows from Corollary 3.3.3. The remaining cases are similar. □

3.3.7. **Corollary.** *For every full left integral ϕ and every full right integral ψ on a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ, the maps ${}_C\phi_C$ and ${}_B\psi_B$ are surjective.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}, \mu$ and ϕ be as above. Then $\psi' := \phi \circ S$ is a full right integral and $A\phi = A\psi'$ by Theorem 3.3.6. This relation and idempotence of A imply ${}_C\phi_C(A) = {\psi'}_C(A) = C$. A similar argument shows that ${}_B\psi_B(A) = B$ for every right integral ψ. □

We now can show that integrals are unique up to scaling by elements of $M(B)$ or $M(C)$, respectively:

3.3.8. **Theorem.** *For every full and faithful left integral ϕ and every full and faithful right integral ψ on a flat regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ,*

$$M(B)\cdot\phi = \{\textit{left integrals } \phi' \textit{ for } (\mathcal{A},\mu)\} = \phi\cdot M(B),$$
$$M(C)\cdot\psi = \{\textit{right integrals } \psi' \textit{ for } (\mathcal{A},\mu)\} = \psi\cdot M(C).$$

Proof. We only prove the assertion concerning left integrals.

Let $\mathcal{A}$, μ and ϕ be as above. Then every element of $M(B)\cdot\phi$ and of $\phi\cdot M(B)$ is a left integral by Proposition 3.2.11.

Conversely, assume that ϕ' is a left integral on $\mathcal{A}$. Since ϕ is faithful by assumption and $A\cdot\phi'\subseteq A\cdot\phi$ and $\phi'\cdot A\subseteq\phi\cdot A$ by Theorem 3.3.6, there exist unique linear maps $\alpha,\beta\colon A\to A$ such that $a\cdot\phi' = \alpha(a)\cdot\phi$ and $\phi'\cdot a = \phi\cdot\beta(a)$ for all $a\in A$. Clearly, $\alpha(ab) = a\alpha(b)$ and $\beta(ab)=\beta(a)b$ for all $a,b\in A$, so that we can regard α as a right and β as a left multiplier of A, respectively, and write $\alpha\cdot\phi = \phi' = \phi\cdot\beta$. Furthermore,

$$\alpha\cdot {}_C\phi_C = {}_C(\alpha\cdot\phi) = {}_C\phi'_C = (\phi\cdot\beta)_C = {}_C\phi_C\cdot\beta,$$

in particular, α and β commute with C.

Choose a full left integral ψ, for example, $\phi\circ S$. We will show that for all $a,b\in A$,

$$a_B\psi_B(b)\alpha = a_B\psi_B(b\alpha), \qquad \beta_B\psi_B(b)a = {}_B\psi_B(\beta b)a. \tag{3.19}$$

These equations imply $B\alpha\subseteq B$ and $\beta B\subseteq B$. We then conclude

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_B(x\alpha\sigma^\mu_B(\phi_B(a))) = \mu_B(\phi_B(a)x\alpha) &= \phi(ax\alpha)\\ &= \phi(\beta a x) = \mu_B(\phi_B(\beta a)x) = \mu_B(x\sigma^\mu_B(\phi_B(\beta a)))\end{aligned}$$

for all $a\in A$, $x\in B$. Since μ_B is faithful and ϕ is full, this relation implies $\alpha B\subseteq B$, that is, $\alpha\subseteq M(B)$. A similar argument shows that also $\beta\in M(B)$.

Therefore, we only need to prove (3.19). We focus on the second equation because it is nicer to work with left multipliers; the first equation follows similarly. Let $a,b\in A$. Since ${}_C\phi'_C = {}_C\phi_C\cdot\beta$ and ${}_C\phi_C$ are left-invariant,

$$(\iota\otimes S_B^{-1}\circ {}_C\phi_C\circ\beta)(\Delta_B(b)(a\otimes 1)) = {}_C\phi_C(\beta b)a = (\iota\otimes S_B^{-1}\circ {}_C\phi_C)(\Delta_C(\beta b)(a\otimes 1)).$$

Since T_λ is surjective, we can conclude

$$(\iota\otimes S_B^{-1}\circ {}_C\phi_C\circ\beta)(\Delta_B(b)(a\otimes cd)) = (\iota\otimes S_B^{-1}\circ {}_C\phi_C)(\Delta_B(\beta b)(a\otimes cd))$$

for all $a,b,c,d\in A$. Since ϕ is faithful and ${}_BA$ is flat, maps of the form $d\cdot {}_C\phi_C$ separate the points of A and slice maps of the form $\iota\otimes S_B^{-1}\circ(d\cdot {}_C\phi_C)$ separate the points of $A\underset{l}{\otimes}A$. Consequently,

$$(\iota\otimes\beta)(\Delta_B(b)(1\otimes c)) = \Delta_B(\beta b)(1\otimes c) \quad \text{for all } a,b,d\in A.$$

We apply ${}_B\psi_B\otimes\iota$, use right-invariance of ${}_B\psi_B$ and the fact that β commutes with C, and find $\beta_B\psi_B(b)c = {}_B\psi_B(\beta b)c$ for all $b,c\in A$. □

Note that the maps $M(A)\to A^\vee$ given by $a\mapsto a\cdot\omega$ and $a\mapsto\omega\cdot a$ are injective for every faithful $\omega\in A^\vee$. Given full and faithful left and right integrals, we thus obtain bijections between $M(B)$ and the space of left integrals, and between $M(C)$ and the

space of right integrals. In particular, we obtain bijections between invertible multipliers and full and faithful left or right integrals.

3.4. **Convolution operators and the modular automorphism.** We next show that $A\omega = \omega A$ for every full left and every full right integral ω, and deduce that every full and faithful integral has a modular automorphism. As a tool, we use the following left and right convolution operators associated to maps ${}_B\upsilon \in {}_BA^\vee$, ${}_C\omega \in {}_CA^\vee$, $\upsilon'_B \in A^\vee_B$ and $\omega'_C \in A^\vee_C$, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lambda({}_B\upsilon)\colon A \to L(A), \quad \lambda({}_B\upsilon)(a)b := ({}_B\upsilon \otimes \iota)(\Delta_B(a)(1\otimes b)),\\
&\rho({}_C\omega)\colon A \to L(A), \quad \rho({}_C\omega)(a)b := (\iota \otimes S_B^{-1}\circ {}_C\omega)(\Delta_B(a)(b\otimes 1)),\\
&\lambda(\upsilon'_B)\colon A \to R(A), \quad b\lambda(\upsilon'_B)(a) := (S_C^{-1}\circ \upsilon'_B \otimes \iota)((1\otimes b)\Delta_C(a)),\\
&\rho(\omega'_C)\colon A \to R(A), \quad b\rho(\omega'_C)(a) := (\iota \otimes \omega'_C)((b\otimes 1)\Delta_C(a)).
\end{aligned}$$

This notation is somewhat ambiguous for elements ${}_B\upsilon_B \in {}_BA^\vee_B$ or ${}_C\omega_C \in {}_CA^\vee_C$, and we shall always write $\rho({}_B\upsilon)$, $\rho(\upsilon_B)$, $\lambda({}_C\omega)$ or $\lambda(\omega_C)$ to indicate which convolution operator is meant. This ambiguity will be resolved in Lemma 3.4.1 (4) below.

Let us collect a few easy observations. For all ${}_B\upsilon, \upsilon'_B, {}_C\omega, \omega'_C$ as above and $a, c \in A$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda(c\cdot {}_B\upsilon)(a) &= ({}_B\upsilon\otimes\iota)(\Delta_B(a)(c\otimes 1)) \in A,\\
\rho(c\cdot {}_C\omega)(a) &= (\iota\otimes S_B^{-1}\circ {}_C\omega)(\Delta_B(a)(1\otimes c)) \in A
\end{aligned}$$

and likewise $\lambda(\upsilon'_B\cdot c)(a), \rho(\omega'_C\cdot c)(a) \in A$. Next,

$$\lambda({}_B\upsilon) = {}_B\upsilon \Leftrightarrow {}_B\upsilon \text{ is right-invariant}, \qquad \rho({}_C\omega) = {}_C\omega \Leftrightarrow {}_C\omega \text{ is left-invariant}, \tag{3.20}$$

$$\lambda(\upsilon'_B) = \upsilon'_B \Leftrightarrow \upsilon'_B \text{ is right-invariant}, \qquad \rho(\omega'_C) = \omega'_C \Leftrightarrow \omega'_C \text{ is left-invariant}, \tag{3.21}$$

where we regard B and C as elements of $L(A)$ or $R(A)$, and finally,

$$\lambda({}_B\varepsilon) = \rho({}_C\varepsilon) = \lambda(\varepsilon_B) = \rho(\varepsilon_C) = \iota_A; \tag{3.22}$$

see diagrams (2.8), (2.13) and Example 3.2.8.

3.4.1. **Lemma.** *Let ${}_B\upsilon \in A\cdot {}_BA^\vee$, $\upsilon'_B \in A^\vee_B\cdot A$, ${}_C\omega \in A\cdot {}_CA^\vee$, $\omega'_C \in A^\vee_C\cdot A$ and $\upsilon := \mu_B\circ {}_B\upsilon$, $\omega := \mu_C\circ {}_C\omega$, $\upsilon' := \mu_B\circ \upsilon'_B$, $\omega' := \mu_C\circ \omega'_C$. Then*

1. *$\varepsilon\circ\lambda({}_B\upsilon) = \upsilon$, $\varepsilon\circ\rho({}_C\omega) = \omega$, $\varepsilon\circ\lambda(\upsilon'_B) = \upsilon'$, $\varepsilon\circ\rho(\omega'_C) = \omega'$;*
2. *$\lambda({}_B\upsilon)$ and $\lambda(\upsilon'_B)$ commute with both $\rho({}_C\omega)$ and $\rho(\omega'_C)$;*
3. *$\upsilon\circ\rho({}_C\omega) = \omega\circ\lambda({}_B\upsilon)$, $\upsilon\circ\rho(\omega'_C) = \omega'\circ\lambda({}_B\upsilon)$, $\upsilon'\circ\rho({}_C\omega) = \omega\circ\lambda(\upsilon'_B)$ and $\upsilon'\circ\rho(\omega'_C) = \omega'\circ\lambda(\upsilon'_B)$;*
4. *if $\upsilon = \upsilon'$ and elements of ${}_\mu A^\vee_\mu$ separate the points of A, then $\lambda({}_B\upsilon) = \lambda(\upsilon'_B)$; if $\omega = \omega'$ and elements of ${}_\mu A^\vee_\mu$ separate the points of A, then $\rho({}_C\omega) = \rho(\omega'_C)$.*

Proof. (1) We only prove the first equation; the others follow similarly. Let $a, c \in A$ and ${}_B\upsilon \in {}_BA^\vee$. Then the counit property implies

$$\begin{aligned}
(\varepsilon\circ\lambda(c\cdot {}_B\upsilon))(a) &= \varepsilon({}_B\upsilon\otimes\iota)(\Delta_B(a)(c\otimes 1))\\
&= \upsilon(\iota\otimes {}_B\varepsilon)(\Delta_B(a)(c\otimes 1)) = \upsilon(ac) = (c\cdot\upsilon)(a).
\end{aligned}$$

(2) Let $a, b, c \in A$ and ${}_B\upsilon \in {}_BA^\vee$, $\omega \in A^\vee_C$. We show that $\lambda(b \cdot {}_B\upsilon)$ commutes with $\rho(\omega_C \cdot c)$, and the other commutation relations follow similarly. The coassociativity condition relating Δ_B and Δ_C implies that for all $a \in A$,

$$\begin{aligned}(\lambda(b \cdot {}_B\upsilon) \circ (\rho(\omega_C \cdot c))(a) &= ({}_B\upsilon \otimes \iota \otimes \omega_C)((\Delta_B \otimes \iota)((1 \otimes c)\Delta_C(a))(b \otimes 1 \otimes 1)) \\ &= ({}_B\upsilon \otimes \iota \otimes \omega_C)((1 \otimes 1 \otimes c)(\iota \otimes \Delta_C)(\Delta_B(a)(b \otimes 1))) \\ &= (\rho(\omega_C \cdot c) \circ \lambda(b \cdot {}_B\upsilon))(a).\end{aligned}$$

(3) Again, we only prove the first equation. By (1) and (2),

$$\upsilon \circ \rho({}_C\omega) = \varepsilon \circ \lambda({}_B\upsilon) \circ \rho({}_C\omega) = \varepsilon \circ \rho({}_C\omega) \circ \lambda({}_B\upsilon) = \omega \circ \lambda({}_B\upsilon).$$

(4) Assume that $\upsilon = \upsilon'$ and that elements of ${}_\mu A^\vee_\mu$ separate the points of A. Since A is non-degenerate, then also functionals of the form like ω separate the points of A, and by (3), $\omega \circ \lambda({}_B\upsilon) = \upsilon \circ \rho({}_C\omega) = \upsilon' \circ \rho({}_C\omega) = \omega \circ \lambda(\upsilon'_B)$, whence $\lambda({}_B\upsilon) = \lambda(\upsilon'_B)$. A similar argument proves the assertion concerning $\rho({}_C\omega)$ and $\rho(\omega'_C)$. □

We come back to the study of convolution operators associated to general elements of ${}_BA^\vee, A^\vee_B, {}_CA^\vee$ and $A^\vee_C$, respectively, when we have proved the existence of a modular automorphism for full and faithful integrals. The next step towards this aim is to rewrite the strong invariance relations in diagrams (3.5) and (3.6) as follows.

3.4.2. **Corollary.** *Let ϕ be a left and ψ a right integral on a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ. Then*

$$\rho(\phi_C \cdot a)(b) = S(\rho(b \cdot {}_C\phi)(a)), \quad \lambda(a \cdot {}_B\psi)(b) = S(\lambda(\psi_B \cdot b)(a)) \quad \text{for all } a, b \in A.$$

Proof. Combine Proposition 3.1.3 and Lemma 3.4.1. □

Iterated applications of the relations above and Theorem 3.3.6 yield the following result.

3.4.3. **Theorem.** *Let ϕ be a full left and ψ a full right integral on a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ. Then $A \cdot \phi = \phi \cdot A$ and $A \cdot \psi = \psi \cdot A$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.3.6, it suffices to prove the assertion for a full left integral ϕ. Let $\psi := \phi \circ S$. Then ψ is a full right integral and $A \cdot \phi = A \cdot \psi$ by Theorem 3.3.6. We show that $\phi \cdot A \subseteq A \cdot \psi$, and a similar argument proves the reverse inclusion.

Let $a, b, c \in A$. Then

$$((a \cdot \phi) \circ \lambda(\psi_B \cdot b))(c) = ((\psi \cdot b) \circ \rho(a \cdot {}_C\phi))(c) = ((S(b) \cdot \phi) \circ S \circ \rho(a \cdot {}_C\phi))(c).$$

Choose $b' \in A$ with $S(b) \cdot \phi = b' \cdot \psi$ and use Corollary 3.4.2 to rewrite the expression above in the form

$$\begin{aligned}((b' \cdot \psi) \circ \rho(\phi_C \cdot c))(a) &= ((\phi \cdot c) \circ \lambda(b' \cdot {}_B\psi))(a) \\ &= ((\phi \cdot c) \circ S \circ \lambda(\psi_B \cdot a))(b') = ((S^{-1}(c) \cdot \psi) \circ \lambda(\psi_B \cdot a))(b').\end{aligned}$$

Again, choose $c' \in A$ with $S^{-1}(c) \cdot \psi = c' \cdot \phi$ and rewrite the expression above in the form

$$((c' \cdot \phi) \circ \lambda(\psi_B \cdot a))(b') = ((\psi \cdot a) \circ \rho(c' \cdot {}_C\phi))(b').$$

Summarising,

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(\lambda(\psi_B \cdot b)(c)a) &= ((a \cdot \phi) \circ \lambda({}_B\psi \cdot b))(c) \\ &= ((\psi \cdot a) \circ \rho(c' \cdot {}_C\phi))(b') = \psi(a\rho(c' \cdot {}_C\phi)(b')).\end{aligned}$$

Here, b and $c \in A$ were arbitrary, and the linear span of all elements of the form

$$\lambda(\psi_B \cdot b)(c) = (S_C^{-1} \circ \psi_B \otimes \iota)((b \otimes 1)\Delta_C(c))$$

is equal to $AS_C^{-1}(\psi_B(A)) = AC = A$ because ${}_\lambda T$ and ψ_B are surjective. Thus, $\phi \cdot A \subseteq A \cdot \psi = A \cdot \phi$. □

3.4.4. **Theorem.** *Let ϕ be a full and faithful left integral and let ψ be a full and faithful right integral on a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ. Then ϕ and ψ possess modular automorphisms σ^ϕ and σ^ψ, respectively, whose extensions to $M(A)$ satisfy*

$$\sigma^\phi(y) = \sigma_C^\mu(y) = S^2(y) \text{ for all } y \in C, \qquad \sigma^\psi(x) = \sigma_B^\mu(x) = S^{-2}(x) \text{ for all } x \in B.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_B \circ \sigma^\phi &= (S^2 \otimes \sigma^\phi) \circ \Delta_B, & \Delta_C \circ \sigma^\phi &= (S^2 \otimes \sigma^\phi) \circ \Delta_C, \\ \Delta_B \circ \sigma^\psi &= (\sigma^\psi \otimes S^{-2}) \circ \Delta_B, & \Delta_C \circ \sigma^\psi &= (\sigma^\psi \otimes S^{-2}) \circ \Delta_C.\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{A}$ is flat, then $\sigma^\phi(M(B)) = M(B)$ and $\sigma^\psi(M(C)) = M(C)$.

Proof. We prove the assertion for a full and faithful left integral ϕ; the case of right integrals is similar.

Since ϕ is faithful and $A \cdot \phi = \phi \cdot A$ by Theorem 3.4.3, there exists a unique bijection $\sigma^\phi \colon A \to A$ such that $\phi \cdot a = \sigma^\phi(a) \cdot \phi$ for all $a \in A$, and this map is easily seen to be an algebra automorphism.

For all $y \in C$, we have $\sigma^\phi(y) = \sigma_C^\mu(y)$ because for all $a \in A$,

$$\phi(ya) = \mu_C(y_C\phi_C(a)) = \mu_C({}_C\phi_C(a)\sigma_C^\mu(y)) = \phi(a\sigma_C^\mu(y)).$$

The tensor product $S^2 \otimes \sigma^\phi$ is well-defined on $A \underset{l}{\otimes} A$ and $A \underset{r}{\otimes} A$ because $\sigma^\phi(y) = \sigma_C^\mu(y) = S^2(y)$ for all $y \in C$. Two applications of Corollary 3.4.2 show that for all $a, b \in A$,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(\phi \cdot a)(\sigma^\phi(b)) = S(\rho(\sigma^\phi(b) \cdot \phi)(a)) &= S(\rho(\phi \cdot b)(a)) \\ &= S^2(\rho(a \cdot \phi)(b)) = S^2(\rho((\phi \cdot a) \circ \sigma^\phi)(b)).\end{aligned}$$

Since $a \in A$ was arbitrary, we can conclude $\Delta_B \circ \sigma^\phi = (S^2 \otimes \sigma^\phi) \circ \Delta_B$ and $\Delta_C \circ \sigma^\phi = (S^2 \otimes \sigma^\phi) \circ \Delta_C$.

Finally, the relation $\sigma^\phi(M(B)) = M(B)$ follows immediately from the relation $M(B) \cdot \phi = \phi \cdot M(B)$ obtained in Theorem 3.3.8. □

The following additional relations will be useful later.

3.4.5. **Lemma.** *Let ϕ be a full and faithful left integral on a flat regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ. Then*

(1) *$\phi_B(xa) = (S^2 \circ \sigma^\phi)(x)\phi_B(a)$ and ${}_B\phi(ax) = (\sigma^\phi \circ S^2)^{-1}(x){}_B\phi(a)$ for all $x \in M(B)$ and $a \in A$;*

(2) ${}_B\phi(A)$ *and* $\phi_B(A)$ *are two-sided ideals in* B *and* $\ker {}_B\phi = \{a \in A : \phi(BaB) = 0\} = \ker \phi_B$*;*
(3) *the map* $\theta\colon \omega_B(A) \to {}_B\omega(A), \omega_B(a) \mapsto {}_B\omega(a)$*, is well-defined and* $\mu_B \circ \theta = \mu_B$*;*
(4) $\mu_B(x\sigma^\phi(x')) = \mu_B(x'\theta(x)) = \mu_B(S^2(\theta(x))x')$ *for all* $x \in B$ *and* $x' \in M(B)$.

Proof. (1) We only prove the first relation; the second one follows similarly. Let $x, x' \in B$ and $a \in A$. By the corollary above, $\sigma^\phi(x) \in M(B)$, whence

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_B(\phi_B(xa)x') = \phi(xax') &= \phi(ax'\sigma^\phi(x)) \\ &= \mu_B(\phi_B(a)x'\sigma^\phi(x)) = \mu_B(S^2(\sigma^\phi(x))\phi_B(a)x').\end{aligned}$$

Here, we used the relation $(\sigma^\mu_B)^{-1}(x) = S^2(x)$; see Proposition 3.2.3. Since $x' \in B$ was arbitrary and μ_B is faithful, the first relation follows.

(2), (3) It is easy to see that (1) implies (2), which in turn implies (3).

(4) Let $a \in A$, $x' \in M(B)$ and $x = \phi_B(a)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_B(x\sigma^\phi(x')) = \phi(a\sigma^\phi(x')) &= \phi(x'a) \\ &= \mu_B(x'{}_B\phi(a)) = \mu_B(x'\theta(x)) = \mu_B(S^2(\theta(x))x').\end{aligned}$$

□

3.5. **More on convolution operators, and the modular element.** The results obtained so far imply that left and right integrals on regular multiplier Hopf algebroids are related by modular elements, very much like in the theory of multiplier Hopf algebras.

3.5.1. **Theorem.** *Let* ϕ *be a full and faithful left integral and let* ψ *be a right integral on a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid* $\mathcal{A}$ *with base weight* μ*. Then there exists a unique multiplier* $\delta_\psi \in M(A)$ *such that* $\psi = \delta_\psi \cdot \phi$*, and this multiplier is invertible if and only if* ψ *is full and faithful.*

Proof. Since ϕ is faithful and $A \cdot \psi \subseteq A \cdot \phi$ and $\psi \cdot A \subseteq \phi \cdot A$ by Theorem 3.3.6, there exist unique linear maps $\alpha, \beta\colon A \to A$ such that $a \cdot \psi = \beta(a) \cdot \phi$ and $\psi \cdot a = \phi \cdot \alpha(a)$ for all $a \in A$. For all $a, b \in A$,

$$a\sigma^\phi(\alpha(b)) \cdot \phi = a \cdot \phi \cdot \alpha(b) = a \cdot \psi \cdot b = \beta(a) \cdot \phi \cdot b = \beta(a)\sigma^\phi(b) \cdot \phi,$$

that is, $a\sigma^\phi(\alpha(b)) = \beta(a)\sigma^\phi(b)$. Thus, $\delta := (\beta, \sigma^\phi \circ \alpha \circ (\sigma^\phi)^{-1})$ is a multiplier of A and $\delta \cdot \phi = \psi$. If ψ is full and faithful, the inclusions $A \cdot \psi \subseteq A \cdot \phi$ and $\psi \cdot A \subseteq \phi \cdot A$ are equalities and the maps β, α are invertible. Conversely, if δ is invertible, then evidently ψ is faithful, and full because then ${}_C\psi(A) = {}_C\phi_C(A\delta) = C$ and likewise $\psi_C(A) = C$ by Corollary 3.3.7. □

In the special case where ψ equals $\phi \circ S^{-1}$ or $\phi \circ S$, we can determine the behaviour of the comultiplication, counits and antipode on the modular elements. For that, we need a few more results on the convolution operators introduced above.

Given a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ and a full and faithful left or right integral ϕ or ψ, we have seen that the space

$$\hat{A} := A \cdot \phi = \phi \cdot A = A \cdot \psi = \psi \cdot A \subseteq {}_\mu A^\vee_\mu \tag{3.23}$$

does not depend on the choice of ϕ or ψ. Elements of $\hat{A}$ naturally extend to functionals on $M(A)$:

3.5.2. **Lemma.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with a base weight μ and full and faithful integrals. Then there exists a unique embedding $j\colon \hat{A} \to M(A)^\vee$ such that*

$$j(a\cdot\phi)(T) = \phi(Ta), \quad j(\phi\cdot a)(T) = \phi(aT), \quad j(a\cdot\psi)(T) = \psi(Ta), \quad j(\psi\cdot a)(T) = \psi(aT)$$

for every $T \in M(A)$, $a \in A$ and every left integral ϕ and right integral ψ on $\mathcal{A}$ adapted to μ.

Proof. The point is, of course, to show that the formulas given above are compatible in the sense that for each $\upsilon \in \hat{A}$, the extension $j(\upsilon)$ is well-defined. This can be done using Theorem 3.4.4 and Theorem 3.5.1, or as follows. Assume, for example, that $a\cdot\omega = b\cdot\psi$, where ϕ and ψ are a left and a right integral on $\mathcal{A}$, respectively, and $a, b \in A$. We have to show that $\phi(Ta) = \psi(Tb)$ for every $T \in M(A)$. Choose a full and faithful left integral ϕ' and write $a = \sum_i c_i d_i$ and $b = \sum_j e_j f_j$ with $a_i, b_i, e_j, f_j \in A$. By Theorem 3.3.6, we find $d_i', f_j' \in A$ such that $d_i\cdot\phi = d_i'\cdot\phi'$ and $f_j\cdot\psi = f_j'\cdot\phi'$ for all i, j. Then

$$\sum_i c_i d_i'\cdot\phi' = a\cdot\phi = b\cdot\psi = \sum_j e_j f_j'\cdot\phi'.$$

Since ϕ' is faithful, we can conclude $\sum_i c_i d_i' = \sum_j e_j f_j'$ and hence

$$\phi(Ta) = \sum_i \phi(Tc_i d_i) = \sum_i \phi'(Tc_i d_i') = \sum_j \phi'(Te_j f_j') = \sum_j \psi(Te_j f_j) = \psi(Tb). \qquad \square$$

We henceforth regard elements of $\hat{A}$ as functionals on $M(A)$ without mentioning the embedding j explicitly.

3.5.3. **Proposition.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with base weight μ and full and faithful integrals. Then the space $\hat{A}$ in* (3.23) *separates the points of A, and for all $\upsilon \in {}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$,$\omega \in \hat{A}$ and $b \in A$, the following relations hold:*

1. *$(\rho(\upsilon_B)(b), \rho({}_B\upsilon)(b))$ and $(\lambda(\upsilon_C)(b), \lambda({}_C\upsilon)(b))$ form two-sided multipliers $\rho(\upsilon)(b)$ and $\lambda(\upsilon)(b)$ of A, respectively, and $\lambda({}_B\omega)(b) = \lambda(\omega_B)(b)$, $\rho({}_C\omega)(b) = \rho(\omega_C)(b)$;*
2. *$\upsilon\circ\rho(\omega) = \omega\circ\lambda(\upsilon)$ and $\upsilon\circ\lambda(\omega) = \omega\circ\rho(\upsilon)$, and both compositions lie in ${}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$;*
3. *$\rho(\upsilon\circ\rho(\omega)) = \rho(\upsilon)\rho(\omega)$ and $\lambda(\upsilon\circ\lambda(\omega)) = \lambda(\upsilon)\lambda(\omega)$;*
4. *$\rho(\upsilon)\circ S = S\circ\lambda(\upsilon\circ S)$ and $\lambda(\upsilon)\circ S = S\circ\rho(\upsilon\circ S)$;*
5. *for all $x, x', x'' \in B$, $y, y', y'' \in C$,*

$$\rho(S_B(x'')x\cdot\upsilon\cdot y''x')(yby') = S_C(y'')y\rho(\upsilon)(xbx)y'x'',$$
$$\lambda(x''y\cdot\upsilon\cdot S_C(y'')y')(xbx') = y''x\lambda(\upsilon)(y'by)x'S_B(x'').$$

Proof. (1), (2) First, observe that Lemma 3.4.1 (4) implies $\lambda({}_B\omega)(b) = \lambda(\omega_B)(b)$ and $\rho({}_C\omega)(b) = \rho(\omega_C)(b)$. We can therefore drop the subscripts B and C and write $\lambda(\omega)$ and $\rho(\omega)$ from now on.

Let $\omega = \phi\cdot a$, where ϕ is a full and faithful left integral and $a \in A$. Then

$$\omega(\rho(\upsilon_C)(b)) = \phi(a\rho(\upsilon_C)(b)) = (\phi \underset{r}{\otimes} \upsilon)((a\otimes 1)\Delta_C(b)) = \upsilon(\lambda(\phi\cdot a)(b)) = \upsilon(\lambda(\omega)(b)).$$

A similar calculation shows that $\omega(\rho_C(\upsilon)(b)) = \upsilon(\lambda(\omega)(b))$. For $\omega \in \hat{A}$ of the form $\omega = c\cdot\phi\cdot a$ with $a, c \in A$, we obtain

$$\phi((a\rho(\upsilon_C)(b))c) = \upsilon(\lambda(\omega)(b)) = \phi(a(\rho({}_C\upsilon)(b)c)).$$

Since $a, c \in A$ were arbitrary and ϕ is faithful, we can conclude that $(a\rho(\upsilon_C)(b))c = a(\rho({}_C\upsilon)(b)c)$ for all $a, c \in A$ so that $\rho({}_C\upsilon)(b)$ and $\rho_C(\upsilon)(b)$ form a two-sided multiplier $\rho(\upsilon)(b)$ as claimed.

Along the way, we just showed that $\omega \circ \rho(\upsilon) = \upsilon \circ \lambda(\omega)$. One easily verifies that this composition belongs to ${}_\mu A^\vee_\mu$, for example, ${}_B(\upsilon \circ \lambda(\omega)) = {}_B\upsilon \circ \lambda(\omega)$ and $(\omega \circ \rho(\upsilon))_C = \omega_C \circ \rho(\upsilon)$.

(3) Let $\omega' \in \hat{A}$. Then $\lambda(\omega')$ commutes with $\rho(\omega)$ by Lemma 3.4.1 and hence

$$\omega' \circ \rho(\upsilon) \circ \rho(\omega) = \upsilon \circ \lambda(\omega') \circ \rho(\omega) = \upsilon \circ \rho(\omega) \circ \lambda(\omega') = \omega' \circ \rho(\upsilon \circ \rho(\omega)).$$

Since $\omega' \in \hat{A}$ was arbitrary and $\hat{A}$ separates the points of A, we can conclude the first relation in (3). A similar argument proves the second one.

(4) These relations follow from the fact that S reverses the comultiplication, see (2.8), (2.13) and (2.19).

(5) This follows from (2.1) and (2.9); for example, the first equation without y'' holds because for all $a \in A$,

$$\begin{aligned}(\rho(S_B(x'')x \cdot \upsilon \cdot x')(yby'))a &= (\iota \otimes S_B^{-1} \circ {}_C\upsilon)((1 \otimes x')\Delta_B(yby')(a \otimes S_B(x'')x)) \\ &= (\iota \otimes S_B^{-1} \circ {}_C\upsilon)((y \otimes 1)\Delta_B(x'bx)(y'x''a \otimes 1)) \\ &= y\rho(\upsilon)(x'bx)y'x''a. \qquad \square\end{aligned}$$

We leave the further study of the convolution operators till Subsection 4.1, where we construct the dual algebra of a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid.

Now, we return to the modular elements defined above and determine the behaviour of the comultiplication, counit and antipode on the modular elements relating a left integral ϕ to the right integrals $\phi \circ S^{-1}$ and $\phi \circ S$. For a multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid, of particular interest is the case that ϕ is self-adjoint in the sense that $\phi(a^*) = \overline{\phi(a)}$ for all $a \in A$.

3.5.4. **Theorem.** *Let ϕ be a full and faithful left integral on a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ. Then there exist unique invertible multipliers $\delta, \delta^\dagger \in M(A)$ such that $\phi \circ S = \delta^\dagger \cdot \phi$ and $\phi \circ S^{-1} = \phi \cdot \delta$. These elements satisfy*

$${}_B\phi(a)\delta^\dagger = \lambda(\phi)(a) = \delta\phi_B(a) \text{ for all } a \in A,$$

$$S(\delta^\dagger) = \delta^{-1}, \quad \varepsilon \cdot \delta = \varepsilon = \delta^\dagger \cdot \varepsilon, \quad \Delta_B(\delta) = \delta^\dagger \otimes \delta, \quad \Delta_C(\delta^\dagger) = \delta \otimes \delta^\dagger.$$

If $\mathcal{A}$ is flat, then $\Delta_C(\delta) = \delta \otimes \delta$ and $\Delta_B(\delta^\dagger) = \delta^\dagger \otimes \delta^\dagger$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid and ϕ is self-adjoint, then $\delta^\dagger = \delta^*$.

Proof. The compositions $\psi^\dagger := \phi \circ S$ and $\psi := \phi \circ S^{-1}$ are full and faithful right integrals by Proposition 3.2.12 and Remark 3.3.5, and of the form $\psi^\dagger = \delta^\dagger \cdot \phi$ and $\psi = \phi \cdot \delta$ with unique invertible multipliers $\delta, \delta^\dagger \in M(A)$ by Theorem 3.5.1 and Theorem 3.4.4. By Proposition 3.5.3 and Corollary 3.4.2,

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(\lambda(\phi)(a)b) &= ((b \cdot \phi) \circ \lambda(\phi))(a) \\ &= (\phi \circ \rho(b \cdot \phi))(a) \\ &= ((\phi \circ S^{-1}) \circ \rho(\phi \cdot a))(b) \\ &= ((\phi \cdot a) \circ \lambda(\psi))(b) \\ &= (\phi \cdot a)({}_B\psi_B(b)) = \phi(a\,{}_B\psi_B(b)) = \psi(\phi_B(a)b) = \phi(\delta\phi_B(a)b)\end{aligned}$$

for all $a, b \in A$, and hence $\lambda(\phi)(a) = \delta\phi_B(a)$ for all $a \in A$. A similar calculation shows that $\lambda(\phi)(a) = {}_B\phi(a)\delta^\dagger$ for all $a \in A$.

The relation $\delta^{-1} = S(\delta^\dagger)$ holds because

$$\phi = \phi \circ S \circ S^{-1} = (\delta^\dagger \cdot \phi) \circ S^{-1} = (\phi \circ S^{-1}) \cdot S(\delta^\dagger) = \phi \cdot \delta S(\delta^\dagger).$$

The properties of the counit imply that

$$\varepsilon(\delta\phi_B(a)b) = \varepsilon(\lambda(\phi)(a)b) = (\phi \underset{B}{\otimes} \varepsilon)(\Delta(a)(1 \otimes b)) = \phi(a_B\varepsilon(b)) = \varepsilon(\phi_B(a)b)$$

for all $a, b \in A$, whence $\varepsilon \cdot \delta = \varepsilon$. A similar calculation shows that $\delta^\dagger \cdot \varepsilon = \varepsilon$.

The relations for the comultiplication require a bit more work. For all $a, b \in A$,

$$\begin{aligned}(\phi \underset{l}{\otimes} \phi)(\Delta_B(\delta a)(1 \otimes b)) &= \phi(\lambda(\phi)(\delta a)b) \\ &= \phi(\delta\phi_B(\delta a)b) = \psi({}_B\psi_B(a)b) = (\psi \underset{l}{\otimes} \psi)(\Delta_B(a)(1 \otimes b)).\end{aligned}$$

Since the map T_ρ is surjective, we can conclude that for all $c, d \in A$,

$$(\phi \underset{l}{\otimes} \phi)(\Delta_B(\delta)(c \otimes d)) = (\psi \underset{l}{\otimes} \psi)(c \otimes d) = \psi(S_B({}_B\psi_B(c))d) = \phi(\delta S_B(\phi_B(\delta c))d).$$

Inserting the relation $\phi_B(\delta c)S^{-1}(\delta) = \phi_B(\delta c)(\delta^\dagger)^{-1} = \delta^{-1}{}_B\phi(\delta c)$, the expression above becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(S(\phi_B(\delta c)S^{-1}(\delta))d) &= \phi(S(\delta^{-1}{}_B\phi(\delta c))d) \\ &= \phi(S_B({}_B\phi(\delta c))S(\delta^{-1})d) = (\phi \underset{l}{\otimes} \phi)(\delta c \otimes S(\delta^{-1})d).\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $\Delta_B(\delta) = \delta \otimes S(\delta)^{-1}$. Since the antipode reverses the comultiplication (see (2.19)), we can conclude

$$\Delta_C(\delta^\dagger) = \Delta_C(S^{-1}(\delta)^{-1}) = \delta \otimes S^{-1}(\delta^{-1}) = \delta \otimes \delta^\dagger.$$

A similar argument shows that $\Delta_B(\delta) = \delta^\dagger \otimes \delta$.

If $\mathcal{A}$ is flat, then the module $(A \underset{r}{\otimes} A)_{(1\otimes B)}$ is non-degenerate by a similar argument as in Lemma 2.6 in [40], and the relation

$$\Delta_C(\delta)(1 \otimes \phi_B(a)) = \Delta_C(\delta\phi_B(a)) = \Delta_C({}_B\phi(a)\tilde{\delta}) = \delta \otimes {}_B\phi(a)\delta^\dagger = (\delta \otimes \delta)(1 \otimes \phi_B(a)),$$

valid for all $a \in A$, implies $\Delta_C(\delta) = \delta \otimes \delta$. A similar reasoning shows that in this case, $\Delta_B(\delta^\dagger) = \delta^\dagger \otimes \delta^\dagger$.

Finally, if $\mathcal{A}$ is a multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid and ϕ is self-adjoint, then

$$\phi(a^*\delta^*) = \overline{\phi(\delta a)} = \overline{\phi \circ S^{-1}(a)} = \phi(S^{-1}(a)^*) = \phi(S(a^*)) = \phi(a^*\delta^\dagger)$$

for all $a \in A$, where we used (2.20), and hence $\delta^* = \delta^\dagger$. □

The proof of Theorem 3.5.1 shows that the tensor products $\delta^\dagger \otimes \delta$, $\delta^\dagger \otimes \delta^\dagger$ and $\delta \otimes \delta$, $\delta \otimes \delta^\dagger$ are well-defined as operators on $A \underset{l}{\otimes} A$ or $A \underset{r}{\otimes} A$, respectively. This also follows from the following intertwining relations.

3.5.5. **Lemma.** *Let ϕ be a full and faithful left integral on a flat regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ, and denote by $\delta, \delta^\dagger \in M(A)$ the unique invertible multipliers such that $\phi \circ S = \delta^\dagger \cdot \phi$ and $\phi \circ S^{-1} = \phi \cdot \delta$. Then for all $x \in M(B)$,*

$$\delta x = \delta S^2(\sigma^\phi(x)), \qquad x\delta^\dagger = \delta^\dagger \sigma^\phi(S^2(x)),$$
$$S(x)\delta = \delta S(\sigma^\phi(S^2(x))), \qquad \delta^\dagger S^{-1}(x) = S(\sigma^\phi(x))\delta^\dagger.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.4.5,

$$\delta S^2(\sigma^\phi(x))\phi_B(a) = \delta\phi_B(xa) = \lambda(\phi)(xa) = x\lambda(\phi)(a) = x\delta\phi_B(a),$$

and a similar calculation shows that $x\delta^\dagger = \delta^\dagger\sigma^\phi(S^2(x))$. To deduce the remaining assertions, use the relation $S(\tilde{\delta}) = \delta^{-1}$. □

3.6. **Faithfulness.** Non-trivial integrals on multiplier Hopf algebras are always faithful, as shown by Van Daele in [43]. We now prove a corresponding statement for integrals on regular multiplier Hopf algebroids, where the former need to be full and the latter projective. Note that both assumptions are trivially satisfied in the case of multiplier Hopf algebras.

3.6.1. **Theorem.** *Every full left and every full right integral on a projective regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with a base weight is faithful.*

Proof. We only prove the assertion for left integrals, closely following the argument in [43]. A similar reasoning applies to right integrals.

Let ϕ be a full left integral on a projective regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ, let $a \in A$ and assume $a \cdot \phi = 0$. Since μ_C is faithful, we can conclude that then also $a \cdot {}_C\phi = 0$. Let $b \in A, \upsilon_B \in A_B^\vee$ and $c := \lambda(\upsilon_B \cdot b)(a)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(\phi_C \cdot d)(c) &= (\rho(\phi_C \cdot d) \circ \lambda(\upsilon_B \cdot b))(a) \\ &= (\lambda(\upsilon_B \cdot b) \circ \rho(\phi_C \cdot d))(a) = (\lambda(\upsilon_B \cdot b) \circ S \circ \rho(a \cdot {}_C\phi))(d) = 0\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

for all $d \in A$, where we used Lemma 3.4.1 and Corollary 3.4.2.

We show that the relation above implies $\varepsilon(c) = 0$, and then we can conclude, using Lemma 3.4.1 again, that

$$(\mu_B \circ \upsilon_B)(ba) = (\varepsilon \circ \lambda(\upsilon_B \cdot b))(a) = \varepsilon(c) = 0.$$

Using the facts that μ_B is faithful, $b \in A$ is arbitrary and A is nondegenerate, and that $\upsilon_B \in A_B^\vee$ is arbitrary and $A_B^\vee$ separates the points of A because the module A_B is projective, we can deduce that $a = 0$.

So, let us prove that (3.24) implies $\varepsilon(c) = 0$. Since A_B is projective, there exist elements $e_i \in A$ and $\omega_B^i \in A_B^\vee$ such that $\sum_i e_i\omega_B^i(d)$ for all $d \in A$, the sum always being finite, and since $A \cdot \phi = \phi \cdot A$ by Theorem 3.4.3, we find elements $e_i' \in A$ such that $S^{-1}(e_i) \cdot \phi = \phi \cdot e_i'$ for all i. Let $f \in A$ and write $(f \otimes 1)\Delta_C(c) = \sum_j f_j \otimes c_j$ with $f_j, c_j \in A$. We take $d = e_i'$ in (3.24), multiply on the left by f, apply $\omega^i := \mu_B \circ \omega_B^i$, sum

over i, and find

$$0 = \sum_i ((\omega^i \cdot f) \circ \rho(\phi_C \cdot e_i'))(c) = \sum_i ((\phi \cdot e_i') \circ \lambda(\omega_B^i \cdot f))(c)$$
$$= \sum_{i,j} \phi(c_j S_B^{-1}(\omega_B^i(f_j)) S^{-1}(e_i)) = \sum_j \phi(c_j S^{-1}(f_j)),$$

where we used Lemma 3.4.1 again. The second diagram in (2.16) shows that

$$\sum_j c_j S^{-1}(f_j) = \sum_j S^{-1}(f_j S(c_j)) = S^{-1}(f S_B({}_B\varepsilon(c))) = {}_B\varepsilon(c) S^{-1}(f),$$

and hence

$$0 = \phi({}_B\varepsilon(c) S^{-1}(f)) = \mu_B({}_B\varepsilon(c)\, {}_B\phi(S^{-1}(f))).$$

Since $f \in A$ was arbitrary, ${}_B\phi$ is surjective and μ_B is faithful, we can conclude ${}_B\varepsilon(c) = 0$ and hence $\varepsilon(c) = 0$. □

4. Duality

In this section, we establish a generalized Pontrjagin duality for regular multiplier Hopf algebroids with full and faithful integrals. In contrast to the duality results on Hopf algebroids found in the literature [1], [21], [37], we need no finiteness or Frobenius condition assumption. As outlined in the introduction, we follow the approach taken by Van Daele in the case of multiplier Hopf algebras [43], but face a number of conceptual and technical difficulties.

4.1. **The dual algebra and dual quantum graphs.** We start with a flat regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with full and faithful integrals. Let us call a functional ω on a $*$-algebra D *positive* if $\omega(d^* d) \geq 0$ for all $d \in D$.

4.1.1. **Definition.** *A* measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid *is a flat regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with a base weight μ and left and right integrals ϕ and ψ, respectively, which are full and faithful. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid and the functionals μ_B, μ_C, ϕ, ψ are positive, we call $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ a* measured multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid.

Given a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$, we have seen that

$$A \cdot \phi = \phi \cdot A = A \cdot \psi = \psi \cdot A \subseteq {}_\mu A_\mu^\vee.$$

We denote this space by $\hat{A}$ as before, and equip it with a convolution product as follows.

4.1.2. **Proposition.** *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ be a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid. Then the subspace $\hat{A} = A \cdot \phi \subseteq {}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$ is an idempotent, non-degenerate algebra, A is an idempotent, non-degenerate and faithful $\hat{A}$-bimodule and ${}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$ is a non-degenerate and faithful $\hat{A}$-bimodule with respect to the products given by*

$$\omega\omega' := \omega \circ \rho(\omega') = \omega' \circ \lambda(\omega) \quad \text{for all } \omega, \omega' \in \hat{A},$$
$$\omega * a = \rho(\omega)(a), \quad a * \omega = \lambda(\omega)(a) \quad \text{for all } a \in A, \omega \in \hat{A},$$
$$\omega \upsilon = \upsilon \circ \lambda(\omega), \qquad \upsilon\omega = \upsilon \circ \rho(\omega) \quad \text{for all } \upsilon \in {}_\mu A_\mu^\vee, \omega \in \hat{A}.$$

We call $\hat{A}$ the *dual algebra* of $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$.

Proof. We first show that the product defined on $\hat{A}$ takes values in $\hat{A}$ again. So, let $\omega, \omega' \in \hat{A}$. Then $\omega \circ \rho(\omega') = \omega' \circ \lambda(\omega)$ by Proposition 3.5.3. To see that this functional lies in $\hat{A}$, write $\omega = a \cdot \phi$ and $\omega' = b \cdot \psi$ with $a, b \in A$ and $a \otimes b = \sum_i \Delta_B(d_i)(e_i \otimes 1)$ with $d_i, e_i \in A$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(\omega \circ \rho(\omega'))(c) &= (\phi \underset{l}{\otimes} \phi)(\Delta_B(c)(a \otimes b)) \\ &= \sum_i (\phi \underset{l}{\otimes} \phi)(\Delta_B(cd_i)(e_i \otimes 1)) \\ &= \sum_i \phi({}_C\phi_C(cd_i)e_i) = \sum_i \phi(cd_i{}_C\phi_C(e_i))\end{aligned}$$

for all $c \in A$, that is

$$\omega \circ \rho(\omega') = f \cdot \phi \quad \text{if} \quad \omega = a \cdot \phi,\ \omega' = b \cdot \phi,\ f = ({}_C\phi_C \otimes \iota)(T_\lambda^{-1}(a \otimes b)). \tag{4.1}$$

The products defined above turn $\hat{A}$ into an algebra and A and ${}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$ into $\hat{A}$-bimodules because $\rho(\omega)\rho(\omega') = \rho(\omega \circ \rho(\omega'))$ and $\lambda(\omega')\lambda(\omega) = \lambda(\omega' \circ \lambda(\omega))$ by Proposition 3.5.3 (3).

Equation (4.1) and bijectivity of the canonical maps T_λ, T_ρ imply that $\hat{A}$ is idempotent as an algebra and A is idempotent as an $\hat{A}$-bimodule. These facts and non-degeneracy of the pairing $\hat{A} \times A \to A$, $(\upsilon, a) \mapsto \upsilon(a)$ imply that A is non-degenerate and faithful as an $\hat{A}$-bimodule. But A being faithful and idempotent as an $\hat{A}$-bimodule implies that the algebra $\hat{A}$ is non-degenerate, and that ${}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$ is non-degenerate and faithful as an $\hat{A}$-bimodule. □

The algebras B, C and $\hat{A}$ can be assembled into left and right quantum graphs as follows.

4.1.3. **Proposition.** *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ be a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with dual algebra $\hat{A}$ and let*

$$\hat{B} := C, \qquad \hat{C} := B, \qquad \hat{S}_{\hat{B}} := S_B^{-1} \colon \hat{B} \to \hat{C}, \qquad \hat{S}_{\hat{C}} := S_C^{-1} \colon \hat{C} \to \hat{B}.$$

Then there exist embeddings $\iota_{\hat{B}} \colon \hat{B} \to M(\hat{A})$ and $\iota_{\hat{C}} \colon \hat{C} \to M(\hat{A})$ such that

$$y\omega = y \cdot \omega, \qquad \omega y = S_B^{-1}(y) \cdot \omega, \qquad x\omega = \omega \cdot S_C^{-1}(x), \qquad \omega x = \omega \cdot x$$

for all $y \in \hat{B}$, $x \in \hat{C}$, $\omega \in \hat{A}$, and the tuples

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\hat{B}} := (\hat{A}, \hat{B}, \iota_{\hat{B}}, \hat{S}_{\hat{B}}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\hat{C}} := (\hat{A}, \hat{C}, \iota_{\hat{C}}, \hat{S}_{\hat{C}})$$

form a left and a right quantum graph, respectively, which are flat and compatible.

We call $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\hat{B}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\hat{C}}$ the *dual left* and *dual right quantum graph* of $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$, respectively.

Proof. For each $x \in B = \hat{C}$, the formulas above define a multiplier $\iota_{\hat{C}}(x)$ of $\hat{A}$ because

$$\upsilon(x\omega) = \upsilon \circ \rho(\omega \cdot S^{-1}(x)) = (\upsilon \cdot x) \circ \rho(\omega) = (\upsilon x)\omega$$

for all $\upsilon, \omega \in \hat{A}$ by Proposition 3.5.3 (5). The assignment $x \mapsto \iota_{\hat{C}}(x)$ evidently is a homomorphism. Similar arguments show that the formulas above define a homomorphism $\iota_{\hat{C}} \colon \hat{C} \to M(\hat{A})$. Evidently, $\iota_{\hat{B}}(\hat{B})$ and $\iota_{\hat{C}}(\hat{C})$ commute.

The module ${}_{\hat{B}}\hat{A}$ is idempotent, non-degenerate, faithful and flat because the map $A \to \hat{A}$ given by $a \mapsto a \cdot \phi$ is an isomorphism from ${}_{C}A$ to ${}_{\hat{B}}\hat{A}$ and the module ${}_{C}A$ has the desired properties. Note that faithfulness implies injectivity of $\iota_{\hat{B}}$. Similar arguments apply to the modules $\hat{A}_{\hat{B}}, {}_{\hat{C}}\hat{A}, \hat{A}_{\hat{C}}$ and yield injectivity of $\iota_{\hat{C}}$. □

In the case of a multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid, we obtain a natural involution on the dual algebra $\hat{A}$ which is admissible with the dual quantum graphs in the sense explained in Subsection 2.3. The proof uses the following easy observation.

4.1.4. **Lemma.** (1) *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ be a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid. Then $\upsilon \circ S \in \hat{A}$ for all $\upsilon \in \hat{A}$.*

(2) *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ be a measured multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid. Then $* \circ \upsilon \circ * \in \hat{A}$ for all $\upsilon \in \hat{A}$.*

Proof. Let $\upsilon \in \hat{A}$ and write $\upsilon = a \cdot \phi$ with $a \in A$. In (1), $\upsilon \circ S = (\phi \circ S) \cdot S^{-1}(a)$ lies in $\hat{A}$ because $\phi \circ S$ is right-invariant, and in (2), $* \circ \upsilon \circ * = \phi \cdot a^* \in \hat{A}$. □

4.1.5. **Proposition.** *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ be a measured multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid. Then the dual algebra $\hat{A}$ is a $*$-algebra with respect to the involution given by $\omega \mapsto \omega^* := * \circ \omega \circ * \circ S$, and this involution is admissible with respect to the dual quantum graphs $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\hat{B}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\hat{C}}$.*

Proof. The map $\omega \mapsto \omega^*$ sends $\hat{A}$ to $\hat{A}$ by Lemma 4.1.4 and is involutive because $* \circ S \circ * \circ S = \iota_A$ by (2.20). To see that it reverses the multiplication, note first that $\rho(\omega) \circ * = * \circ \rho(* \circ \omega \circ *)$ because Δ_B and Δ_C are $*$-homomorphisms. Using Proposition 4.1.2, we can conclude

$$(\upsilon * \omega)^* = * \circ \upsilon \circ \rho(\omega) \circ * \circ S = * \circ \upsilon \circ * \circ S \circ \lambda(* \circ \omega \circ * \circ S) = \omega^* * \upsilon^*.$$

The embedding $\iota_{\hat{B}}$ is a $*$-homomorphism because for all $y \in \hat{B} = C$ and $\omega \in \hat{A}$,

$$(y\omega)^* = * \circ (y \cdot \omega) \circ * \circ S = S^{-1}(y^*) \cdot (* \circ \omega \circ * \circ S) = \omega^* y^*.$$

A similar calculation shows that $\iota_{\hat{C}}$ is a $*$-homomorphism as well. □

Given a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with dual algebra $\hat{A}$, let

$$\hat{\mu} = (\hat{\mu}_{\hat{B}}, \hat{\mu}_{\hat{C}}), \qquad \text{where} \qquad \hat{\mu}_{\hat{B}} := \mu_C \in \hat{B}^\vee, \qquad \hat{\mu}_{\hat{C}} := \mu_B \in \hat{C}^\vee. \tag{4.2}$$

Dual to ${}_{\mu}A^\vee_{\mu}$, we denote by

$${}_{\hat{\mu}}\hat{A}^\vee_{\hat{\mu}} := (\hat{\mu}_{\hat{B}})_*({}_{\hat{B}}\hat{A}) \cap (\hat{\mu}_{\hat{B}})_*(\hat{A}_{\hat{B}}) \cap (\hat{\mu}_{\hat{C}})_*({}_{\hat{C}}\hat{A}) \cap (\hat{\mu}_C)_*(\hat{A}_{\hat{C}}) \subseteq (\hat{A})^\vee \tag{4.3}$$

the space of all functionals ω on $\hat{A}$ that can be written in the form

$$\omega = \hat{\mu}_{\hat{B}} \circ {}_{\hat{B}}\omega = \hat{\mu}_{\hat{B}} \circ \omega_{\hat{B}} = \hat{\mu}_{\hat{C}} \circ {}_{\hat{C}}\omega = \hat{\mu}_{\hat{C}} \circ \omega_{\hat{C}}$$

with ${}_{\hat{B}}\omega \in {}_{\hat{B}}\hat{A}$, $\omega_{\hat{B}} \in \hat{A}_{\hat{B}}$, ${}_{\hat{C}}\omega \in {}_{\hat{C}}\hat{A}$, $\omega_{\hat{C}} \in \hat{A}_{\hat{C}}$. By Lemma 3.5.2, functionals in $\hat{A}$ naturally extend to $M(A)$. Dually, evaluation on a multiplier gives a functional in ${}_{\hat{\mu}}\hat{A}^\vee_{\hat{\mu}}$.

4.1.6. **Lemma.** *Let $(\mathcal{A},\mu,\phi,\psi)$ be a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with dual algebra $\hat{A}$ and dual base weight $\hat{\mu}$ and let $T\in M(A)$. Then the functional $T^\vee\colon \hat{A}\to\mathbb{C}$ given by $\omega\to\omega(T)$ lies in ${}_{\hat{\mu}}\hat{A}^\vee_{\hat{\mu}}$, and for all $a\in A$,*

$$
\begin{aligned}
{}_{\hat{B}}(T^\vee)(\phi\cdot a) &= S^2({}_C\phi_C(aT)), & (T^\vee_{\hat{B}})(\psi\cdot a) &= S^{-1}({}_B\psi_B(aT)),\\
{}_{\hat{C}}(T^\vee)(a\cdot\phi) &= S^{-1}({}_C\phi_C(Ta)), & (T^\vee_{\hat{C}})(a\cdot\psi) &= S^2({}_B\psi_B(Ta)).
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. The functional $T^\vee$ lies in $(\hat{\mu}_{\hat{B}})_*({}_{\hat{B}}\hat{A}^\vee)\cap(\hat{\mu}_{\hat{B}})_*(\hat{A}^\vee_{\hat{B}})$ and the equations concerning ${}_{\hat{B}}(T^\vee)$ and $T^\vee_{\hat{B}}$ hold because for all $y\in C=\hat{B}$,

$$T^\vee(y(\phi\cdot a))=T^\vee(y\cdot\phi\cdot a)=\phi(aTy)=\mu_C({}_C\phi_C(aT)y)=\mu_C(yS^2({}_C\phi_C(aT)))$$

and likewise

$$
\begin{aligned}
T^\vee((\psi\cdot a)y)=T^\vee(S^{-1}(y)\cdot\psi\cdot a)&=\mu_B({}_B\psi_B(aT)S^{-1}(y))\\
&=\mu_B(S(y){}_B\psi_B(aT))=\mu_C(S^{-1}({}_B\psi_B(aT))y).
\end{aligned}
$$

Similar calculations show that $T^\vee$ lies in $(\hat{\mu}_{\hat{C}})_*({}_{\hat{C}}\hat{A}^\vee)\cap(\hat{\mu}_{\hat{C}})_*(\hat{A}^\vee_{\hat{C}})$ and that the equations concerning ${}_{\hat{C}}(T^\vee)$ and $T^\vee_{\hat{C}}$ hold. □

4.2. **The dual regular multiplier Hopf algebroid.** We now equip the dual left and right quantum graphs $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\hat{B}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\hat{C}}$ of a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $(\mathcal{A},\mu,\phi,\psi)$ with a left and a right comultiplication so that we obtain a flat regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$. Rather than defining these comultiplications directly, we construct the associated canonical maps. We start with the canonical maps of $\mathcal{A}$, which induce dual maps

$$(T_\rho)^\vee\colon (A\underset{l}{\otimes}A)^\vee\to(A\underset{B}{\otimes}A)^\vee,\qquad ({}_\lambda T)^\vee\colon (A\underset{r}{\otimes}A)^\vee\to(A\underset{C}{\otimes}A)^\vee, \tag{4.4}$$

$$(T_\lambda\Sigma)^\vee\colon (A\underset{l}{\otimes}A)^\vee\to(A\underset{C}{\otimes}A)^\vee,\qquad ({}_\rho T\Sigma)^\vee\colon (A\underset{r}{\otimes}A)^\vee\to(A\underset{B}{\otimes}A)^\vee. \tag{4.5}$$

Next, we identifiy the relative tensor products

$$\hat{A}\underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes}\hat{A},\qquad \hat{A}\underset{\hat{B}}{\otimes}\hat{A},\qquad \hat{A}\underset{\hat{l}}{\otimes}\hat{A}={}_{\hat{B}}\hat{A}\otimes_{\hat{S}_{\hat{B}}(\hat{B})}\hat{A},\qquad \hat{A}\underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes}\hat{A}=\hat{A}_{\hat{S}_{\hat{C}}(\hat{C})}\otimes\hat{A}_{\hat{C}}$$

with certain subspaces of the domains and ranges of the maps above as follows. As explained in Subsection 3.3, we can form for all $\upsilon,\omega\in\hat{A}\subseteq{}_\mu A^\vee_\mu$ certain tensor products

$$\upsilon\underset{l}{\otimes}\omega\in(A\underset{l}{\otimes}A)^\vee,\quad \upsilon\underset{r}{\otimes}\omega\in(A\underset{r}{\otimes}A)^\vee,\quad \upsilon\underset{C}{\otimes}\omega\in(A\underset{C}{\otimes}A)^\vee,\quad \upsilon\underset{B}{\otimes}\omega\in(A\underset{B}{\otimes}A)^\vee. \tag{4.6}$$

Using the embedding $A\to{}_{\hat{\mu}}\hat{A}^\vee_{\hat{\mu}}$ defined in Lemma 4.1.6, we can also form for all $a,b\in A$ tensor products

$$a^\vee\underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes}b^\vee\in(\hat{A}\underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes}\hat{A})^\vee,\quad a^\vee\underset{\hat{B}}{\otimes}b^\vee\in(\hat{A}\underset{\hat{B}}{\otimes}\hat{A})^\vee,\quad a^\vee\underset{\hat{l}}{\otimes}b^\vee\in(\hat{A}\underset{\hat{l}}{\otimes}\hat{A})^\vee,\quad a^\vee\underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes}b^\vee\in(\hat{A}\underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes}\hat{A})^\vee.$$

4.2.1. **Lemma.** *For all $a,b\in A$ and $\upsilon,\omega\in\hat{A}$, the following relations hold:*

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\upsilon\underset{l}{\otimes}\omega)(a\otimes b)&=(a^\vee\underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes}b^\vee)(\upsilon\otimes\omega), & (\upsilon\underset{r}{\otimes}\omega)(a\otimes b)&=(a^\vee\underset{\hat{B}}{\otimes}b^\vee)(\upsilon\otimes\omega),\\
(\upsilon\underset{C}{\otimes}\omega)(a\otimes b)&=(a^\vee\underset{\hat{l}}{\otimes}b^\vee)(\upsilon\otimes\omega), & (\upsilon\underset{B}{\otimes}\omega)(a\otimes b)&=(a^\vee\underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes}b^\vee)(\upsilon\otimes\omega).
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. We only prove the first equation. By Lemma 4.1.6,

$$(\upsilon \underset{l}{\otimes} \omega)(a \otimes b) = \mu_B(S^{-1}({}_C\omega(b))_B\upsilon(a)) = \mu_B(S^2({}_B\upsilon(a))S^{-1}({}_C\omega(b))) \\ = \hat{\mu}_{\hat{C}}(a^\vee_{\hat{C}}(\upsilon)_{\hat{C}}b^\vee(\omega)) = (a^\vee \underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes} b^\vee)(\upsilon \otimes \omega). \quad \square$$

4.2.2. **Lemma.** *There exist well-defined embeddings*

$$\hat{A} \underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \hookrightarrow (A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)^\vee, \quad \hat{A} \underset{\hat{B}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \hookrightarrow (A \underset{r}{\otimes} A)^\vee, \quad \hat{A} \underset{\hat{l}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \hookrightarrow (A \underset{C}{\otimes} A)^\vee, \quad \hat{A} \underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \hookrightarrow (A \underset{B}{\otimes} A)^\vee$$

that map each elementary tensor $\upsilon \otimes \omega$ to the respective products in (4.6).

Proof. Lemma 4.2.1 implies that these maps are well-defined. We show that the first map is injective, and similar arguments apply to the other maps. For all $a, b \in A$ and $\upsilon, \omega \in \hat{A}$,

$$(\upsilon \underset{l}{\otimes} \omega)(a \otimes b) = (a^\vee \underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes} b^\vee)(\upsilon \otimes \omega) = a^\vee((\iota \otimes {}_{\hat{C}}b^\vee)(\upsilon \otimes \omega)).$$

Since maps of the form $a^\vee$ and ${}_{\hat{C}}b^\vee$ with $a, b \in A$ separate the points of $\hat{A}$ and the module $\hat{A}_{\hat{C}}$ is flat, products of the form $a^\vee \underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes} b^\vee$ separate the points of $\hat{A} \underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes} \hat{A}$. Therefore, the map $\hat{A} \underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \hookrightarrow (A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)^\vee$ is injective. $\square$

We henceforth identify the respective domains and ranges of the embeddings above without further notice.

4.2.3. **Lemma.** *The maps $(T_\rho)^\vee$, $({}_\lambda T)^\vee$, $(T_\lambda\Sigma)^\vee$ and $({}_\rho T\Sigma)^\vee$ induce bijections*

$$ {}_\lambda\hat{T} \colon \hat{A} \underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \to \hat{A} \underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes} \hat{A}, \qquad \hat{T}_\rho \colon \hat{A} \underset{\hat{B}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \to \hat{A} \underset{\hat{l}}{\otimes} \hat{A}, $$
$$ \hat{T}_\lambda\Sigma \colon \hat{A} \underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \to \hat{A} \underset{\hat{l}}{\otimes} \hat{A}, \qquad {}_\rho\hat{T}\Sigma \colon \hat{A} \underset{\hat{B}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \to \hat{A} \underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes} \hat{A}. $$

Proof. Again, we only treat the first map, and similar arguments apply to the others. We only need to show that $(T_\rho)^\vee(\hat{A} \underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes} \hat{A}) = \hat{A} \underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes} \hat{A}$ or, equivalently, that the two subspaces of $(A \underset{B}{\otimes} A)^\vee$ spanned by functionals of the form $(\upsilon \underset{l}{\otimes} \omega) \circ T_\rho$ or $\upsilon \underset{B}{\otimes} \omega$, respectively, where $\upsilon, \omega \in \hat{A}$, coincide. So, let $\upsilon, \omega \in \hat{A}$, $a, b \in A$ and write $\upsilon = \psi \cdot c$, $\omega = \psi \cdot d$ with $c, d \in A$. Then

$$(\upsilon \underset{l}{\otimes} \omega)(T_\rho(a \otimes b)) = (\upsilon \underset{l}{\otimes} \omega)(\Delta_B(a)(1 \otimes b))) = \psi(d\lambda(\psi \cdot c)(a)b),$$
$$(\upsilon \underset{B}{\otimes} \omega)(a \otimes b) = \omega({}_B\psi_B(ca)b) = \psi(d_B\psi_B(ca)b).$$

Thus, it suffices to show that the two subspaces of $\mathrm{End}(A)$ spanned by maps of the form $a \mapsto d\lambda(\psi \cdot c)(a)$ or $a \mapsto d_B\psi_B(ca)$, where $c, d \in A$, coincide. But

$$d\lambda(\psi \cdot c)(a) = (S_C^{-1} \circ {}_B\psi_B \otimes \iota)((c \otimes d)\Delta_C(a)),$$

and using bijectivity of ${}_\rho T$ and right-invariance of ${}_B\psi_B$, we can conclude that maps of the form $a \mapsto d\lambda(\psi \cdot c)(a)$, where $c, d \in A$, and maps of the form

$$a \mapsto (S_C^{-1} \circ {}_B\psi_B \otimes \iota)((1 \otimes d')\Delta_C(c'a)) = d'{}_B\psi_B(c'a),$$

where $c', d' \in A$, span the same subspace. □

To prove that the bijections $(\hat{T}_\lambda, \hat{T}_\rho)$ and $({}_\lambda\hat{T}, {}_\rho\hat{T})$ obtained above form multiplicative pairs, we will use the functional on $\hat{A}$ given by evaluation at $1_{M(A)}$, see Lemma 4.1.6, which later will turn out to be the counit of the dual multiplier Hopf algebroid $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$.

4.2.4. **Lemma.** *Let $\hat{\varepsilon} := 1^\vee_{M(A)} \in {}_{\hat{\mu}}\hat{A}^\vee_{\hat{\mu}}$. Then for all $a \in A, y \in C, x \in B, \omega \in \hat{A}$,*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&{}_{\hat{B}}\hat{\varepsilon}(a \cdot \phi) = {}_C\phi_C(a), && \hat{\varepsilon}_{\hat{B}}(a \cdot \psi) = S_B({}_B\psi_B(a)), && {}_{\hat{B}}\hat{\varepsilon}(\hat{S}_{\hat{B}}(y)\omega) = {}_{\hat{B}}\hat{\varepsilon}(\omega)y,\\
&{}_{\hat{C}}\hat{\varepsilon}(\phi \cdot a) = S_C({}_C\phi_C(a)), && \hat{\varepsilon}_{\hat{C}}(\psi \cdot a) = {}_B\psi_B(a), && \hat{\varepsilon}_{\hat{C}}(\omega\hat{S}_{\hat{C}}(x)) = x\hat{\varepsilon}_{\hat{C}}(\omega),
\end{aligned}
$$

and the following diagrams commute, where $\hat{m}$ denotes the multiplication maps:

$$
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\hat{A} \underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes} \hat{A} & \xleftarrow{{}_\rho\hat{T}\Sigma} & \hat{A} \underset{\hat{B}}{\otimes} \hat{A} & \xrightarrow{\hat{T}_\rho} & \hat{A} \underset{\hat{l}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \\
& {\scriptstyle \hat{\varepsilon}_{\hat{B}}\otimes\iota} \searrow \quad \downarrow {\scriptstyle \hat{m}} \quad \swarrow {\scriptstyle \hat{S}^{-1}_{\hat{C}}\circ{}_{\hat{B}}\hat{\varepsilon}\otimes\iota} & & & \\
& \hat{A}, & & &
\end{array}
\qquad\qquad
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\hat{A} \underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes} \hat{A} & \xleftarrow{{}_\lambda\hat{T}} & \hat{A} \underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes} \hat{A} & \xrightarrow{\hat{T}_\lambda\Sigma} & \hat{A} \underset{\hat{l}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \\
& {\scriptstyle \iota\otimes\hat{\varepsilon}_{\hat{C}}} \searrow \quad \downarrow {\scriptstyle \hat{m}} \quad \swarrow {\scriptstyle \iota\otimes\hat{S}^{-1}_{\hat{B}}\circ{}_{\hat{C}}\hat{\varepsilon}} & & & \\
& \hat{A}, & & &
\end{array}
$$

Proof. We first prove the formulas involving ${}_{\hat{B}}\hat{\varepsilon}$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_{\hat{B}}$, which follow from the fact that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{\varepsilon}(y(a \cdot \phi)) &= \hat{\varepsilon}(ya \cdot \phi) = \phi(ya) = \mu_C(y\,{}_C\phi_C(a)),\\
\hat{\varepsilon}((a \cdot \psi)y) &= \hat{\varepsilon}(S^{-1}(y)a \cdot \psi) = \mu_B(S^{-1}(y)\,{}_B\psi_B(a)) = \mu_C(S({}_B\psi_B(a))y),\\
{}_{\hat{B}}\hat{\varepsilon}(\hat{S}(y)(a \cdot \phi)) &= {}_{\hat{B}}\hat{\varepsilon}(a \cdot \phi \cdot S^{-2}(y)) = {}_{\hat{B}}\hat{\varepsilon}(ay \cdot \phi) = {}_C\phi_C(a)y
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $x \in B$, $y \in C$, $a \in A$. The formulas involving ${}_{\hat{C}}\hat{\varepsilon}$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_{\hat{C}}$ follow similarly.

Next, we show that $(\iota \otimes \hat{\varepsilon}_{\hat{C}}) \circ {}_\lambda\hat{T} = \hat{m}$; commutativity of the other triangles follows similarly. Let $\upsilon, \omega \in \hat{A}$ and $a \in A$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
((\iota \otimes \hat{\varepsilon}_{\hat{C}})({}_\lambda\hat{T}(\upsilon \otimes \omega)))(a) &= (a^\vee \underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes} \hat{\varepsilon})((\upsilon \underset{l}{\otimes} \omega) \circ T_\rho)\\
&= \hat{\varepsilon}((\upsilon \underset{l}{\otimes} \omega)(T_\rho(a \otimes -)))\\
&= \hat{\varepsilon}(\omega \cdot \lambda(\upsilon)(a)) = \omega(\lambda(\upsilon)(a)) = (\upsilon\omega)(a).
\end{aligned}
$$
□

We can now prove the main result of this subsection.

4.2.5. **Theorem.** *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ be a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid. Then there exist a unique left and a unique right comultiplication $\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{B}}$ and $\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{C}}$ for the dual quantum graphs $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\hat{B}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\hat{C}}$, respectively, such that the associated canonical maps $(\hat{T}_\lambda, \hat{T}_\rho)$*

and $({}_\lambda\hat{T}, {}_\rho\hat{T})$ *make the following diagrams commute:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \hat{A} \underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes} \hat{A} & \xrightarrow{\hat{T}_\lambda \Sigma} & \hat{A} \underset{\hat{l}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ (A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)^\vee & \xrightarrow[(T_\lambda \Sigma)^\vee]{} & (A \underset{C}{\otimes} A)^\vee \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} \hat{A} \underset{\hat{B}}{\otimes} \hat{A} & \xrightarrow{\hat{T}_\rho} & \hat{A} \underset{\hat{l}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ (A \underset{r}{\otimes} A)^\vee & \xrightarrow[({}_\lambda T)^\vee]{} & (A \underset{C}{\otimes} A)^\vee \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \hat{A} \underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes} \hat{A} & \xrightarrow{{}_\lambda\hat{T}} & \hat{A} \underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ (A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)^\vee & \xrightarrow[(T_\rho)^\vee]{} & (A \underset{B}{\otimes} A)^\vee \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} \hat{A} \underset{\hat{B}}{\otimes} \hat{A} & \xrightarrow{{}_\rho\hat{T}\Sigma} & \hat{A} \underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ (A \underset{r}{\otimes} A)^\vee & \xrightarrow[({}_\rho T\Sigma)^\vee]{} & (A \underset{B}{\otimes} A)^\vee \end{array}$$

The pair $\hat{\mathcal{A}} = ((\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\hat{B}}, \hat{\Delta}_{\hat{B}}), (\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\hat{C}}, \hat{\Delta}_{\hat{C}}))$ *is a flat, regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with antipode* $\hat{S}$ *and left and right counits* ${}_{\hat{B}}\hat{\varepsilon}$ *and* $\hat{\varepsilon}_{\hat{C}}$ *given by*

$$\hat{S}(\omega) = \omega \circ S, \quad {}_{\hat{B}}\hat{\varepsilon}(a \cdot \phi) = {}_C\phi_C(a), \quad \hat{\varepsilon}_{\hat{C}}(\psi \cdot a) = {}_B\psi_B(a) \quad \text{for all } \omega \in \hat{A}, a \in A.$$

The pair $\hat{\mu} = (\hat{\mu}_{\hat{B}}, \hat{\mu}_{\hat{C}}) := (\mu_C, \mu_B)$ *is a base weight for* $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$*. Finally, if* $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ *is a measured multiplier Hopf* $*$*-algebroid, then* $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ *is a multiplier Hopf* $*$*-algebroid with respect to the involution* $\omega \mapsto * \circ \omega \circ * \circ S$ *on* $\hat{A}$*.*

In the situation above, we call $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ the *dual regular multiplier Hopf algebroid* or *dual multiplier Hopf* $*$*-algebroid* of $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$.

Proof. We first show that $(\hat{T}_\lambda, \hat{T}_\rho)$ make the diagrams (2.6) and (2.7) commute. Consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} {}_{S(B)}A \otimes_{(B\otimes 1)} (A \underset{r}{\otimes} A) & \xleftarrow{\iota \otimes {}_\lambda T} & {}_{S(B)}A \otimes_{(B\otimes 1)} (A \underset{C}{\otimes} A) \\ {\scriptstyle \Sigma T_\lambda \Sigma \otimes \iota}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \Sigma T_\lambda \Sigma \otimes \iota} \\ A \underset{C}{\otimes} A \underset{r}{\otimes} A & \xleftarrow[\iota \otimes {}_\lambda T]{} & A \underset{C}{\otimes} A \underset{C}{\otimes} A. \end{array}$$

It commutes because both compositions are given by

$$a \otimes b \otimes c \mapsto (\Sigma(\Delta_B(a)) \otimes 1)(1 \otimes b \otimes 1)(1 \otimes \Delta_C(c)).$$

Taking transposes, we find that the square in the following diagram commutes:



By Lemma 4.2.4, the left triangle and the lower triangle commute as well. Hence, the upper left triangle commutes as well.

Taking the transpose of the pentagon diagram for ${}_\lambda T$ given in Proposition 5.11 of [40], we find that the outer rectangle in the diagram below commutes:



The triangles commute by Lemma 4.2.4 again, and hence the lower left cell commutes.

Therefore, the diagrams (3.2) and (3.3) in Definition 3.1 in [40] commute. The verification of the intertwining relations (3.1) in this definition is straightforward. Summarizing, we find that $(\hat{T}_\lambda, \hat{T}_\rho)$ is a left multiplicative pair. By Proposition 3.3 in [40], there exists a unique associated left comultiplication $\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{B}}$ for $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\hat{B}}$.

Similar arguments show that $({}_\lambda\hat{T}, {}_\rho\hat{T})$ is a right multiplicative pair, and Proposition 5.8 in [40] then yields a unique associated right comultiplication $\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{C}}$ for $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\hat{C}}$.

We claim that $({}_\lambda\hat{T}, {}_\rho\hat{T})$ is compatible with $(\hat{T}_\lambda, \hat{T}_\rho)$ in the sense of Definition 6.4 in [40]. Since (T_λ, T_ρ) and $({}_\lambda T, {}_\rho T)$ are compatible, the following diagrams commute:



Taking the transposes, one obtains the corresponding diagrams for $(\hat{T}_\lambda, \hat{T}_\rho)$ and $(\hat{T}_\lambda, \hat{T}_\rho)$.

Therefore, the pair $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is a multiplier bialgebroid. It is a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid because the maps $\hat{T}_\lambda, \hat{T}_\rho, {}_\lambda\hat{T}, {}_\rho\hat{T}$ are bijective by Lemma 4.2.3.

The formulas for the counits follow immediately from Lemma 4.2.4. In particular, these formulas show that the counits are surjective.

Let us show that the transpose of the antipode S of $\mathcal{A}$ coincides with the antipode $\hat{S}$ of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$. By (2.18), the following diagrams commute:



Taking the transpose of the first diagram gives the second diagram with $\hat{S} \otimes \iota$ replaced by $S^\vee \otimes \iota$, whence $\hat{S} = S^\vee$.

The pair $\hat{\mu}$ is a base weight for $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ because $\hat{\mu}_{\hat{B}} \circ {}_{\hat{B}}\varepsilon = \varepsilon = \hat{\mu}_{\hat{C}} \circ \varepsilon_{\hat{C}}$ by Lemma 4.2.4.

Finally, assume that $(\mathcal{A},\mu,\phi,\psi)$ is a measured multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid. To prove that $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is a multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid, it suffices to show that $(*\otimes *)\circ\hat{T}_\rho\circ(*\otimes *)={}_\rho\hat{T}$. Inserting the definition of the involution and of the maps $\hat{T}_\rho$ and ${}_\rho\hat{T}$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}((*\otimes *)\circ\hat{T}_\rho\circ(*\otimes *))(\upsilon\overset{\hat{B}}{\otimes}\omega) &= (\upsilon\overset{\hat{B}}{\otimes}\omega)\circ(*\otimes *)\circ(S\otimes S)\circ{}_\lambda T\circ(S^{-1}\otimes S^{-1})\circ(*\otimes *)\\ &= (\upsilon\overset{\hat{B}}{\otimes}\omega)\circ(*\otimes *)\circ\Sigma\circ{}_\rho T\circ\Sigma\circ\circ(*\otimes *)\\ &= (\upsilon\overset{\hat{B}}{\otimes}\omega)\circ\Sigma\circ T_\rho\circ\Sigma\\ &= {}_\rho\hat{T}(\upsilon\overset{\hat{B}}{\otimes}\omega)\end{aligned}$$

for all $\upsilon,\omega\in\hat{A}$, where we used (2.19) and Lemma 7.2 of [40]. □

4.3. **The full duality and biduality.** To conclude the main results of this article, the duality and biduality of measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroids, we need to construct invariant weights on the dual. This can again be done in a similar way as in the case of multiplier Hopf algebras, see [43].

4.3.1. **Theorem.** *Let $(\mathcal{A},\mu,\phi,\psi)$ be a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid. Then the dual regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ constructed in Theorem 4.2.5 and the functionals*

$$\hat{\mu}_{\hat{B}}=\mu_C,\quad \hat{\mu}_{\hat{C}}=\mu_B,\quad \hat{\phi}\colon\hat{A}\to\mathbb{C},\ \psi\cdot a\mapsto\varepsilon(a),\quad \hat{\psi}\colon\hat{A}\to\mathbb{C},\ a\cdot\phi\mapsto\varepsilon(a),\tag{4.7}$$

form a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid again. Moreover,

$$\hat{\phi}((\psi\cdot S(a))\omega)=\omega(a),\quad \sigma^{\hat{\phi}}(\psi\cdot a)=(\psi\circ S)\cdot S^{-2}(a),\quad \sigma^{\hat{\phi}}(y)=(\sigma^{\psi})^{-1}(y),\tag{4.8}$$

$$\hat{\psi}(\omega(S(b)\cdot\phi))=\omega(b),\quad \sigma^{\hat{\psi}}(a\cdot\phi)=S^2(a)\cdot(\phi\circ S),\quad \sigma^{\hat{\psi}}(x)=(\sigma^{\phi})^{-1}(x)\tag{4.9}$$

for all $a,b\in A$, $x\in B$, $y\in C$ and $\omega\in\hat{A}$. Finally, if $(\mathcal{A},\mu,\phi,\psi)$ is a measured multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid, then $(\hat{\mathcal{A}},\hat{\mu},\hat{\phi},\hat{\psi})$ is a measured multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid and

$$\hat{\psi}((a\cdot\phi)^*(a\cdot\phi))=\phi(a^*a)\quad\text{and}\quad\hat{\phi}((\psi\cdot a)(\psi\cdot a)^*)=\psi(aa^*)\quad\text{for all } a\in A.$$

In the situation above, we call $(\hat{\mathcal{A}},\hat{\mu},\hat{\phi},\hat{\psi})$ the *dual* of $(\mathcal{A},\mu,\phi,\psi)$.

Proof. To prove that $(\hat{\mathcal{A}},\hat{\mu},\hat{\phi},\hat{\psi})$ is a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid, we only need to show that $\hat{\phi}$ and $\hat{\psi}$ are full and faithful left and right integrals on $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ adapted to $\hat{\mu}$, respectively. We focus on $\hat{\psi}$; the arguments concerning $\hat{\phi}$ are similar.

We first show that the functional $\hat{\psi}$ belongs to ${}_{\hat{\mu}}\hat{A}^{\vee}_{\hat{\mu}}$ and that

$$\begin{aligned}{}_{\hat{B}}\hat{\psi}(a\cdot\phi)={}_C\varepsilon(a)=\hat{\psi}_{\hat{B}}(a\cdot\phi),\\ {}_{\hat{C}}\hat{\psi}(a\cdot\phi)=S^{-1}(\varepsilon_C(a)),\quad \hat{\psi}_{\hat{C}}(a\cdot\phi)=S^2(\theta(\varepsilon_B(a)))\end{aligned}\tag{4.10}$$

for all $a\in A$, where θ is given by $\phi_B(a)\mapsto{}_B\phi(a)$; see Lemma 3.4.5. Let $y,y'\in C$ and $x\in B$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\psi}(y(a\cdot\phi)y') &= \hat{\psi}(yS^{-1}(y')a\cdot\phi)=\varepsilon(yS^{-1}(y')a)\\ &= \mu_B(S^{-1}(y'){}_B\varepsilon(a)S^{-1}(y))=\mu_C(yS({}_B\varepsilon(a))y'),\end{aligned}$$

and $S \circ {}_B\varepsilon = {}_C\varepsilon$ by Example 3.2.8. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\psi}(x(a\cdot\phi)) = \hat{\psi}(a\cdot\phi\cdot S^{-1}(x)) &= \hat{\psi}(aS(x)\cdot\phi)\\ &= \varepsilon(aS(x)) = \mu_C(\varepsilon_C(a)S(x)) = \mu_B(xS^{-1}(\varepsilon_C(a))),\end{aligned}$$

where we used the relation $\sigma^\phi(S^{-1}(x)) = S(x)$ (see Theorem 3.4.4), and

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\psi}((a\cdot\phi)x) = \hat{\psi}(a\cdot\phi\cdot x) &= \hat{\psi}(a\sigma^\phi_B(x)\cdot\phi)\\ &= \varepsilon(a\sigma^\phi_B(x)) = \mu_B(\varepsilon_B(a)\sigma^\phi_B(x)) = \mu_B(S^2(\theta(\varepsilon_B(a))x)\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 3.4.5. Since $a \in A$ was arbitrary, these calculations show that $\hat{\psi}$ lies in ${}_{\hat{\mu}}\hat{A}^{\vee}_{\hat{\mu}}$ and that the relations (4.10) hold. Using Proposition 2.3.3 (1) and the fact that ϕ is full, we see that ε_B and ε_C and hence also ${}_{\hat{C}}\hat{\psi}$ and $\hat{\psi}_{\hat{C}}$ are surjective.

We next show that ${}_{\hat{B}}\hat{\psi}_{\hat{B}}$ is right-invariant. Let $\upsilon = a\cdot\phi$ and $\omega = b\cdot\psi$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(\hat{\psi}\underset{\hat{l}}{\otimes}c^{\vee})(\hat{T}_\rho(\upsilon\otimes\omega)) &= \hat{\psi}((\upsilon\underset{r}{\otimes}\omega)({}_\lambda T(-\otimes c)))\\ &= \hat{\psi}(\rho(\omega)(c)\cdot\upsilon)\\ &= \varepsilon(\rho(\omega)(c)a)\\ &= \mu_C(\varepsilon_C(\rho(\omega)(c)){}_C\varepsilon(a))\\ &= \mu_C(\omega_C(c){}_C\varepsilon(a))\\ &= \mu_C({}_C\varepsilon(a)S^2(\omega_C(c))) = (\hat{\psi}\underset{\hat{B}}{\otimes}c^{\vee})(\upsilon\otimes\omega),\end{aligned}$$

where we used 3.16, Lemma 4.1.6, Proposition 3.5.3 (5) and (4.10). Since $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is flat and elements of the form $c^{\vee}$ with $c \in A$ separate the points of $\hat{A}$, we can conclude that $\hat{\psi}$ is right-invariant.

Let us prove the first equation in (4.9). By (4.1), $(a\cdot\phi)(b\cdot\phi) = c\cdot\phi$, where $c = ({}_C\phi_C\otimes\iota)(T_\lambda^{-1}(a\otimes b))$. Using the relation $T_\lambda^{-1} = (S^{-1}\otimes\iota)_\lambda T(S\otimes\iota)$, see (2.17), and the counit property, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\psi}((a\cdot\phi)(b\cdot\phi)) &= (\phi\overset{C}{\otimes}\varepsilon)(T_\lambda^{-1}(a\otimes b))\\ &= (\phi\circ S^{-1}\underset{r}{\otimes}\varepsilon)({}_\lambda T(S(a)\otimes b)) = \phi(S^{-1}(S(a)b)) = \phi(S^{-1}(b)a).\end{aligned}$$

Since ϕ is faithful, we can conclude that $\hat{\psi}$ is faithful as well. Moreover, with $\omega := S^{-2}(b)\cdot(\phi\circ S)$, we can conclude that

$$\hat{\psi}((a\cdot\phi)(b\cdot\phi)) = \phi(S^{-1}(b)a) = (\phi\cdot S^{-1}(b))(a) = \omega(S(a)) = \hat{\psi}(\omega(a\cdot\phi))$$

and hence $(\sigma^{\hat{\psi}})^{-1}(b\cdot\phi) = S^{-2}(b)\cdot(\phi\circ S) = S^{-2}(b)\delta^{\dagger}\cdot\phi$ in the notation of Theorem 3.5.4. The formula for $\sigma^{\hat{\psi}}$ in (4.9) follows.

The relation $\sigma^{\hat{\psi}}(x) = (\sigma^{\phi})^{-1}(x)$ holds for all $x \in B$ because for all $a, b \in A$,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\psi}(x(a\cdot\phi)(b\cdot\phi)) &= \hat{\psi}((a\cdot\phi\cdot S^{-1}(x))(b\cdot\phi))\\ &= \phi(S^{-1}(x)S^{-1}(b)a)\\ &= \hat{\psi}((a\cdot\phi)(bx\cdot\phi)) = \hat{\psi}((a\cdot\phi)(b\cdot\phi)(\sigma^\phi_B)^{-1}(x)).\end{aligned}$$

□

Finally, assume that $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ is a measured multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid. Then $\hat{\mu}_{\hat{B}} = \mu_C$ and $\hat{\mu}_{\hat{C}} = \mu_B$ are positive by assumption, and

$$\hat{\psi}((a \cdot \phi)^*(a \cdot \phi)) = (a \cdot \phi)^*(S^{-1}(a)) = \phi(S(S^{-1}(a))^* a)^* = \phi(a^* a)$$

for all $a \in A$ by (4.9). A similar calculation shows that $\hat{\phi}((\psi \cdot a)(\psi \cdot a)^*) = \psi(aa^*)$, and consequently, $\hat{\psi}$ and $\hat{\phi}$ are positive.

4.3.2. **Theorem.** *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ be a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid or a measured multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid and let $(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \hat{\mu}, \hat{\phi}, \hat{\psi})$ be its dual. Then the map $A \to (\hat{A})^\vee$ given by $a \mapsto a^\vee$ is an isomorphism from $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ to the bi-dual $(\hat{\hat{\mathcal{A}}}, \hat{\hat{\mu}}, \hat{\hat{\phi}}, \hat{\hat{\psi}})$.*

Proof. We first show that the map above identifies the left and right quantum graphs (B, A, ι_B, S_B) and (C, A, ι_C, S_C) with the left and right quantum graphs $(\hat{\hat{B}}, \hat{\hat{A}}, \iota_{\hat{\hat{B}}}, \hat{\hat{S}}_{\hat{\hat{B}}})$ and $(\hat{\hat{C}}, \hat{\hat{A}}, \iota_{\hat{\hat{C}}}, \hat{\hat{S}}_{\hat{\hat{C}}})$, respectively. By definition, $\hat{\hat{B}} = \hat{C} = B$ and $\hat{\hat{C}} = \hat{B} = C$. Equation (4.9) implies that for all $b \in A$ and $\upsilon \in \hat{A}$,

$$((S(b) \cdot \phi) \cdot \hat{\psi})(\upsilon) = \hat{\psi}(\upsilon(S(b) \cdot \phi)) = \upsilon(b) = b^\vee(\upsilon).$$

Since $\hat{\hat{A}} = \hat{A} \cdot \hat{\psi}$, we can conclude that the map $b \mapsto b^\vee = (S(b) \cdot \phi) \cdot \hat{\psi}$ is a linear isomorphism from A to $\hat{\hat{A}}$. This isomorphism is B-linear because for all $x \in B$,

$$\begin{aligned} x((S(b) \cdot \phi) \cdot \hat{\psi}) &= x(S(b) \cdot \phi) \cdot \hat{\psi} \\ &= (S(b) \cdot \phi \cdot S^{-1}(x)) \cdot \hat{\psi} = (S(b)S(x) \cdot \phi) \cdot \psi = S(xb) \cdot \psi \end{aligned}$$

and

$$((S(b) \cdot \phi) \cdot \hat{\psi})x = \hat{S}^{-1}(x)(S(b) \cdot \phi) \cdot \hat{\psi} = (S(x)S(b) \cdot \phi) \cdot \hat{\psi} = S(bx) \cdot \hat{\phi}.$$

Similar calculations show that the isomorphism $b \mapsto b^\vee$ is C-linear. By definition, $\hat{\hat{S}}_{\hat{\hat{B}}} = \hat{S}_{\hat{B}}^{-1} = S_B$, $\hat{\hat{S}}_{\hat{\hat{C}}} = \hat{S}_{\hat{C}}^{-1} = S_C$, and the base weight $\hat{\hat{\mu}}$ is equal to $(\hat{\mu}_{\hat{C}}, \hat{\mu}_{\hat{B}}) = (\mu_B, \mu_C)$.

Let us next consider the canonical maps of $\hat{\hat{\mathcal{A}}}$. By construction and Lemma 4.2.1, the map $\hat{\hat{T}}_\rho$ satisfies

$$(\hat{\hat{T}}_\rho(a^\vee \otimes b^\vee))(\upsilon \otimes \omega) = (a^\vee \underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes} b^\vee)({}_\lambda\hat{T}(\upsilon \otimes \omega)) = (\upsilon \underset{l}{\otimes} \omega)(T_\rho(a \otimes b))$$

for all $a, b \in A$ and $\upsilon, \omega \in \hat{A}$. Therefore, the isomorphism $a \mapsto a^\vee$ identifies $\hat{\hat{T}}_\rho$ with T_ρ, and similar arguments show that it identifies the maps $\hat{\hat{T}}_\lambda, {}_\lambda\hat{\hat{T}}, {}_\rho\hat{\hat{T}}$ with $T_\lambda, {}_\lambda T, {}_\rho T$, respectively.

The left integral $\hat{\hat{\phi}}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\hat{\phi}}(a^\vee) = \hat{\hat{\phi}}((S(a) \cdot \phi) \cdot \hat{\psi}) &= \hat{\varepsilon}((\sigma^{\hat{\psi}})^{-1}(S(a) \cdot \phi)) \\ &= \hat{\varepsilon}(S^{-1}(a) \cdot (\phi \circ S)) = (\phi \circ S)(S^{-1}(a)) = \phi(a) \end{aligned}$$

for all $a \in A$, where we used the formula for $\sigma^{\hat{\psi}}$ obtained in the proof of Theorem 4.3.1. A similar argument shows that $\hat{\hat{\psi}}(a^\vee) = \psi(a)$.

Finally, assume that $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ is a measured multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid and let $b \in A$, $\upsilon \in \hat{A}$. Then $(b^\vee)^*(\upsilon) = b^\vee(\hat{S}(\upsilon)^*)^*$ and $\hat{S}(\upsilon)^* = * \circ (\upsilon \circ S) \circ * \circ S = * \circ \upsilon \circ *$ because $S * \circ * S = *$ by (2.20), whence $(b^\vee)^*(\upsilon) = \upsilon(b^*)$. Therefore, the map $A \to \hat{\hat{A}}$ given by $b \mapsto b^\vee$ is a $*$-isomorphism. □

4.4. **The duality on the level of multipliers.** Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ be a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid as before. Then the canonical maps of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ dualise the canonical maps of $\mathcal{A}$, and intuitively, the multiplication and the comultiplication of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ dualise the comultiplication and the multiplication of $\mathcal{A}$, respectively. We now make this idea precise and study the duality on the level of multiplier algebras.

First, recall that the multiplier algebra $M(A)$ embeds into ${}_{\hat{\mu}}\hat{A}^\vee_{\hat{\mu}}$ by Lemma 4.1.6. By biduality, $M(\hat{A})$ embeds into ${}_\mu A^\vee_\mu$. In the case of a multiplier Hopf algebra (H, Δ), Kustermans showed in [24] that $M(\hat{H})$ identifies with the subspace of all functionals $\upsilon \in H^\vee$ satisfying $(\iota \otimes \upsilon)(\Delta(a)) \in H$ and $(\upsilon \otimes \iota)(\Delta(a)) \in H$ for all $a \in H$. We extend this result to the present context, the following result being the first step.

4.4.1. **Lemma.** *Let $\upsilon \in {}_\mu A^\vee_\mu$.*

(1) *$\upsilon(a \cdot \phi) = (\lambda(\upsilon \circ S^{-1})(a)) \cdot \phi = S(\rho(\upsilon)(S^{-1}(a))) \cdot \phi$ for all $a \in A$.*
(2) *$\rho(\upsilon)(a) \in A$ and $\lambda(\upsilon)(a) \in A$ for all $a \in A$ if and only if $\upsilon\omega \in \hat{A}$ and $\omega\upsilon \in \hat{A}$ for all $\omega \in \hat{A}$.*

Proof. (1) Let $a, b \in A$. By Corollary 3.4.2 and Proposition 3.5.3 (4),

$$\begin{aligned}(\upsilon(a \cdot \phi))(b) = \upsilon(\rho(a \cdot \phi)(b)) &= \upsilon(S^{-1}(\rho(\phi \cdot b)(a))) \\ &= (\phi \cdot b)(\lambda(\upsilon \circ S^{-1})(a)) \\ &= (\lambda(\upsilon \circ S^{-1})(a) \cdot \phi)(b) = (S(\rho(\upsilon)(S^{-1}(a))) \cdot \phi)(b).\end{aligned}$$

(2) Assertion (1) implies that $\upsilon(a \cdot \phi)$ belongs to $\hat{A}$ if and only if $\rho(\upsilon)(S^{-1}(a))$ lies in A. A similar argument completes the proof. □

The next result will not be used but may prove useful elsewhere.

4.4.2. **Lemma.** *Let $\upsilon \in {}_\mu A^\vee_\mu$ such that $\rho(\upsilon)(a) \in A$ and $\lambda(\upsilon)(a) \in A$ for all $a \in A$. Then $\varepsilon \circ \rho(\upsilon) = \upsilon = \varepsilon \circ \lambda(\upsilon)$.*

Proof. We only prove the first equation. Equation (3.16), the counit properties (2.13) and Proposition 3.5.3 (5) imply

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon(\rho(\upsilon)(\varepsilon_C(b)a)) &= \varepsilon(\varepsilon_C(b)\rho(\upsilon)(a)) \\ &= \varepsilon(b\rho(\upsilon)(a)) \\ &= (\varepsilon \otimes \upsilon)((b \otimes 1)\Delta_C(a)) \\ &= \upsilon((S_B^{-1} \circ \varepsilon_C \otimes \iota)((b \otimes 1)\Delta_C(a))) = \upsilon(\varepsilon_C(b)a)\end{aligned}$$

for all $a, b \in A$. Since $\varepsilon_C(A)A = A$, we can conclude $\varepsilon \circ \rho(\upsilon) = \upsilon$. □

We can now identify the multiplier algebra $M(\hat{A})$ with a subspace of ${}_\mu A^\vee_\mu$ as follows.

4.4.3. **Theorem.** *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ be a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with dual algebra $\hat{A}$. Denote by $\tilde{A} \subseteq {}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$ the subspace of all υ satisfying that $\rho(\upsilon)(a) \in A$ and $\lambda(\upsilon)(a) \in A$ for all $a \in A$. Then each $\upsilon \in \tilde{A}$ defines a multiplier of $\hat{A}$ such that $\upsilon\omega = \upsilon \circ \rho(\omega)$ and $\omega\upsilon = \upsilon \circ \lambda(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \hat{A}$, and the resulting map $\tilde{A} \to M(\hat{A})$ is a linear isomorphism. With respect to this isomorphism, ε corresponds to the unit $1_{M(\hat{A})}$, and the elements $x \in B = \hat{C}$ and $y \in C = \hat{B}$ correspond to the functionals $\varepsilon \cdot x$ and $y \cdot \varepsilon$, respectively.*

Proof. The map $\tilde{A} \to M(\hat{A})$ is well-defined and injective by Lemma 4.4.1 and Proposition 4.1.2. We only need to show that this map is surjective. So, let $T \in M(\hat{A})$ and define $\upsilon \in A^\vee$ by

$$\upsilon(a) := \hat{\psi}(T(S(a) \cdot \phi)),$$

where $\hat{\psi}$ denotes the dual right integral defined in Theorem 4.3.1. We claim that υ belongs to ${}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$. Indeed, using Proposition 4.1.3 and the relation $y \cdot \phi = \phi \cdot S^{-2}(y)$ from Theorem 3.4.4, we find that for all $x \in B$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\upsilon(xa) = \hat{\psi}(T(S(a)S(x) \cdot \phi)) &= \hat{\psi}(T(S(a) \cdot \phi \cdot S^{-1}(x))) \\
&= \hat{\psi}(Tx(S(a) \cdot \phi)) = \mu_B(x_{\hat{C}}\hat{\psi}((S(a) \cdot \phi)\sigma^{\hat{\psi}}(T))), \\
\upsilon(ax) = \hat{\psi}(T(S(x)S(a) \cdot \phi)) &= \hat{\psi}(TS(x)(S(a) \cdot \phi)) \\
&= \mu_C(S(x)_{\hat{B}}\hat{\psi}((S(a) \cdot \phi)\sigma^{\hat{\psi}}(T))) \\
&= \mu_B(S^{-1}({}_{\hat{B}}\hat{\psi}((S(a) \cdot \phi)\sigma^{\hat{\psi}}(T)))x).
\end{aligned}$$

Similar calculations show that $\upsilon(ya)$ and $\upsilon(ay)$ can be written in the form $\mu_C(y_C\upsilon(a))$ and $\upsilon(ay) = \mu_C(\upsilon_C(a)y)$ with suitable maps ${}_C\upsilon, \upsilon_C$.

We finally show that $T = \upsilon$. Let $a \in A$. Then equation (4.9) and an application of Lemma 4.4.1 (1) to ω show that

$$(T\omega)(a) = \hat{\psi}(T\omega(S(a) \cdot \phi)) = \hat{\psi(}T(S(\rho(\omega)(a)) \cdot \phi)) = \upsilon(\rho(\omega)(a)) = (\upsilon\omega)(a).$$

In the special case where $T = x \in B = \hat{C}$ or $T = y \in C = \hat{C}$, the assertion follows easily from the fact that ε, regarded as an element of $M(\hat{A})$, acts as the identity. Alternatively, in the first case, the corresponding functional υ is given in by

$$\upsilon(a) = \hat{\psi}(x(S(a) \cdot \phi)) = \hat{\psi}((S(a) \cdot \phi \cdot S^{-1}(x))) = \varepsilon(S(a)S(x)) = \varepsilon(xa),$$

where we used Example 3.2.8, and a similar calculation applies to the second case. □

The dual algebra $\hat{A} = A \cdot \phi = \phi \cdot A$ evidently is a bimodule over $M(A)$, and $\hat{\hat{A}}$ is a bimodule over $M(\hat{A})$. The corresponding $M(\hat{A})$-bimodule structure on A, which is obtained via the identification $A \to \hat{\hat{A}}$, $a \mapsto a^\vee$, in Lemma 4.1.6, takes the following form.

4.4.4. **Lemma.** *Let $a \in A$ and $\upsilon \in \tilde{A} \cong M(\hat{A})$. Then $\upsilon \cdot a^\vee = (\rho(\upsilon)(a))^\vee$ and $a^\vee \cdot \upsilon = (\lambda(\upsilon)(a))^\vee$.*

Proof. We only prove the first equation. For all $\omega \in \hat{A}$,

$$(\upsilon \cdot a^{\vee})(\omega) = a^{\vee}(\omega\upsilon) = (\omega\upsilon)(a) = (\omega \circ \rho(\upsilon))(a) = (\rho(\upsilon)(a))^{\vee}(\omega). \qquad \square$$

The multiplication on $\hat{A}$ dualizes the comultiplication on A, and the same is true when we pass to $M(A)$. To make this assertion precise, we first extend the comultiplications of $\mathcal{A}$ to multipliers.

Let us write $(A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)_{(A\otimes A)}$ and ${}_{(A\otimes A)}(A \underset{r}{\otimes} A)$ when we regard $A \underset{l}{\otimes} A$ and $A \underset{r}{\otimes} A$ as a right or as a left module over $A \otimes A$ via right or left multiplication, respectively.

4.4.5. **Lemma.** *The maps Δ_B and Δ_C extend uniquely to homomorphisms*

$$\Delta_B \colon L(A) \to \mathrm{End}((A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)_{(A\otimes A)}), \qquad \Delta_C \colon R(A) \to \mathrm{End}({}_{(A\otimes A)}(A \underset{r}{\otimes} A))$$

such that the following diagrams commute for each $a \in L(A)$ and $b \in R(A)$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A \underset{C}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{T_\lambda} & A \underset{l}{\otimes} A & \xleftarrow{T_\rho} & A \underset{B}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle \iota\otimes a}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \Delta_B(a)} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle a\otimes\iota} \\ A \underset{C}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow[T_\lambda]{} & A \underset{l}{\otimes} A & \xleftarrow[T_\rho]{} & A \underset{B}{\otimes} A \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccccc} A \underset{C}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow{{}_\lambda T} & A \underset{r}{\otimes} A & \xleftarrow{{}_\rho T} & A \underset{B}{\otimes} A \\ {\scriptstyle \iota\otimes b}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \Delta_C(b)} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle b\otimes\iota} \\ A \underset{C}{\otimes} A & \xrightarrow[{}_\lambda T]{} & A \underset{r}{\otimes} A & \xleftarrow[{}_\rho T]{} & A \underset{B}{\otimes} A \end{array}$$

Proof. Straightforward. $\square$

Note that the algebras $\mathrm{End}((A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)_{(A\otimes A)})$ and $\mathrm{End}({}_{(A\otimes A)}(A \underset{r}{\otimes} A))$ naturally embed into $L((A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)_{(A\otimes A)})$ and $R({}_{(A\otimes A)}(A \underset{r}{\otimes} A))$, respectively.

4.4.6. **Lemma.** *There exist embeddings*

$$L((A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)_{(A\otimes A)}) \to (\hat{A} \underset{\hat{C}}{\otimes} \hat{A})^{\vee}, \qquad R({}_{(A\otimes A)}(A \underset{r}{\otimes} A)) \to (\hat{A} \underset{\hat{B}}{\otimes} \hat{A})^{\vee}$$

given by

$$e((a \cdot \phi) \otimes (b \cdot \phi)) := (\phi \underset{l}{\otimes} \phi)(e(a \otimes b)), \qquad f((\phi \cdot a) \otimes (\phi \cdot b)) := (\phi \underset{r}{\otimes} \phi)((a \otimes b)f)$$

for all $a, b \in A$, $e \in L((A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)_{A\otimes A})$, $f \in R({}_{(A\otimes A)}(A \underset{r}{\otimes} A))$.

Proof. Similar arguments as in the case of Lemma 4.2.1 show that the maps above are well-defined. Assume that $e \in L((A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)_{(A\otimes A)})$ and $e(\upsilon \otimes \omega) = 0$ for all $\upsilon, \omega \in \hat{A}$. Then $e(a \cdot \upsilon \otimes b \cdot \omega) = (\upsilon \underset{l}{\otimes} \omega)(e(a \otimes b)) = 0$ for all $\upsilon, \omega \in \hat{A}$ and $a, b \in A$, and by the dual version of Lemma 4.2.2, we can conclude that $e(a \otimes b) = 0$ for all $a, b \in A$, whence $e = 0$. A similar argument shows that the second map is injective. $\square$

We now can evaluate the images $\Delta_B(c)$ and $\Delta_C(c)$ of a multiplier $c \in M(A)$ using the embeddings above, and make precise the idea that the comultiplication dualises the multiplication.

4.4.7. **Proposition.** *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ be a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with dual algebra $\hat{A}$. Then for all $\upsilon, \omega \in \hat{A}$ and $c \in M(A)$,*

$$(\Delta_B(c))(\upsilon \otimes \omega) = (\upsilon\omega)(c) = (\Delta_C(c))(\upsilon \otimes \omega).$$

Proof. Write $\upsilon = a \cdot \phi$, $\omega = b \cdot \psi$ and $a \otimes b = \sum_i \Delta_B(d_i)(e_i \otimes 1)$ with $a, b, d_i, e_i \in A$. Then $\upsilon\omega = \sum_i d_{iC}\phi_C(e_i) \cdot \phi$ by (4.1) and

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta_B(c))(\upsilon \otimes \omega) &= (\phi \underset{l}{\otimes} \phi)(\Delta_B(c)(a \otimes b)) \\ &= \sum_i (\phi \underset{l}{\otimes} \phi)(\Delta_B(cd_i)(e_i \otimes 1)) \\ &= \phi({}_C\phi_C(cd_i)e_i) = \phi(cd_{iC}\phi_C(e_i)) = (\upsilon\omega)(c).\end{aligned}$$ □

By construction, the canonical maps of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ dualize the canonical maps of $\mathcal{A}$. We next show that the same is true on the level of multipliers. To make this assertion precise, we first extend the canonical maps $T_\lambda, T_\rho, {}_\lambda T, {}_\rho T$ to maps

$$T_\lambda \colon L(A) \overset{M(C)}{\otimes} L(A) \to L((A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)_{(A\otimes A)}), \quad T_\rho \colon L(A) \underset{M(B)}{\otimes} L(A) \to L((A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)_{(A\otimes A)}),$$

$${}_\lambda T \colon R(A) \underset{M(C)}{\otimes} R(A) \to R({}_{(A\otimes A)}(A \underset{r}{\otimes} A)), \quad {}_\rho T \colon R(A) \overset{M(B)}{\otimes} R(A) \to R({}_{(A\otimes A)}(A \underset{r}{\otimes} A))$$

using formulas (2.4) and (2.12) and Lemma 4.4.5. Next, we identify $M(\hat{A})$ with a subspace of ${}_\mu A^\vee_\mu$ as in Theorem 4.4.3 and obtain maps

$$\begin{aligned} M(\hat{A}) \underset{M(\hat{B})}{\otimes} M(\hat{A}) &\to (A \underset{r}{\otimes} A)^\vee, \quad \upsilon \otimes \omega \mapsto \upsilon \underset{r}{\otimes} \omega, \\ M(\hat{A}) \underset{M(\hat{C})}{\otimes} M(\hat{A}) &\to (A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)^\vee, \quad \upsilon \otimes \omega \mapsto \upsilon \underset{l}{\otimes} \omega; \end{aligned}$$

see also (3.14) and (3.15).

4.4.8. **Proposition.** *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ be a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid. Then the following diagrams commute:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M(\hat{A}) \underset{M(\hat{B})}{\otimes} M(\hat{A}) & \xrightarrow{\hat{T}_\rho} & L((\hat{A} \underset{\hat{l}}{\otimes} \hat{A})_{\hat{A}\otimes\hat{A}}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (A \underset{r}{\otimes} A)^\vee & \xrightarrow[(\lambda T)^\vee]{} & (A \underset{C}{\otimes} A)^\vee \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} M(\hat{A}) \underset{M(\hat{C})}{\otimes} M(\hat{A}) & \xrightarrow{\lambda\hat{T}} & R({}_{(\hat{A}\otimes\hat{A})}(\hat{A} \underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes} \hat{A})) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (A \underset{l}{\otimes} A)^\vee & \xrightarrow[(T_\rho)^\vee]{} & (A \underset{B}{\otimes} A)^\vee \end{array}$$

Proof. Let $\upsilon, \omega \in M(\hat{A})$ and $a, b \in A$. Then by definition, Proposition 4.4.7 and Lemma 4.4.4,

$$\begin{aligned}(\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{B}}(\upsilon)(1 \otimes \omega))(a^\vee \otimes b^\vee) &= (\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{B}}(\upsilon))(a^\vee \otimes \omega \cdot b^\vee) \\ &= \upsilon(a\rho(\omega)(b)) = (\upsilon \underset{l}{\otimes} \omega)((a \otimes 1)\Delta_C(b)).\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Therefore, the first diagram commutes. A similar argument applies to the second diagram. □

5. Examples

We now consider two examples of regular multiplier Hopf algebroids presented in [40], the function algebra of an étale, locally compact, Hausdorff groupoid and a two-sided crossed product which appeared already in [11]. Given a quasi-invariant measure on the unit space of the groupoid or invariant functionals for the actions underlying the crossed product, we construct base weights and integrals for these examples and obtain measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroids. Finally, we give a detailed description of the respective dual objects, which in the groupoid case turns out to be the groupoid algebra of compactly supported functions equipped with the convolution product.

5.1. **Étale groupoids.** We assume basic terminology for topological groupoids, see [34] or [36], and recall that a locally compact, Hausdorff groupoid is *étale* if its source and the target maps locally are homeomorphisms. Given a locally compact, Hausdorff space X, we denote by $C(X)$ the $*$-algebra of all continuous functions on X and by $C_c(X) \subseteq C(X)$ the subalgebra of all functions with compact support, and identify $C(X)$ with the multiplier algebra $M(C_c(X))$ in the natural way. Given a continuous map $f\colon X \to Y$ of locally compact, Hausdorff spaces, we denote by $f^*\colon C(Y) \to C(X)$ the pull-back. Given spaces X, Y, Z and maps $f\colon X \to Z$, $g\colon Y \to Z$, we denote by $X_f{\times}_g Y := \{(x,y) \in X \times Y : f(x) = g(y)\}$ the pull-back.

5.1.1. **Proposition.** *Let G be an étale, locally compact, second countable, Hausdorff groupoid with unit space X, target and source maps $t, s\colon G \to X$, multiplication map $m\colon G_s{\times}_t G \to G$ and inversion map $j\colon G \to G$, and let*

$$A := C_c(G), \quad B := s^*(C_c(X)), \quad C := t^*(C_c(X)), \quad S_B := j^*|_B, \quad S_C := j^*|_C.$$

Then $\mathcal{A}_B := (B, A, \iota, S_B)$ and $\mathcal{A}_C := (C, A, \iota, S_C)$ are compatible left and right quantum graphs. The algebras $L_{\mathrm{reg}}(A_B{\times}A)$ and $R_{\mathrm{reg}}(A \times_C A)$ can be identified with a subalgebra of $C(G_s{\times}_t G)$ that contains the image of the map

$$\Delta_B := \Delta_C := m^*\colon C_c(G) \to C(G_s{\times}_t G),$$

and $\mathcal{A} := ((\mathcal{A}_B, \Delta_B), (\mathcal{A}_C, \Delta_C))$ is a projective multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid. Its antipode and left and right counit are given by

$$S(f) = j^*(f), \qquad {}_B\varepsilon(f) = s^*(f|_X), \qquad \varepsilon_C(f) = t^*(f|_X) \qquad \text{for all } f \in C_c(G).$$

Proof. This is a summary of Section 8 in [40], apart from the projectivity assertion. We show that $C_c(G)$ is projective as a module over $s^*(C_c(X))$.

Using the assumptions on G, we find a locally finite partition of unity $(\chi_i)_i$ on G and a family of functions $(\theta_i)_i$ in $C_c(G)$ such that for each i, the function θ_i equals 1 on $\operatorname{supp}\chi_i$ and the map s restricts to a local homeomorphism s_i on some neighbourhood of $\operatorname{supp}\theta_i$. Then the maps

$$j\colon C_c(G) \to \prod_i C_c(X),\ f \mapsto ((s_i^{-1})^*(\chi_i f))_i$$

and

$$p\colon \prod_i C_c(X) \to C_c(G),\ (g_i)_i \mapsto \sum_i \theta_i s_i^*(g_i)$$

satisfy $p \circ j = \iota_{C_c(G)}$ and are morphisms of $C_c(X) \cong s^*(C_c(X))$-modules. Therefore, $C_c(G)$ embeds as a direct summand into a free $C_c(X)$-module. □

Let G be an étale, locally compact, second countable, Hausdorff groupoid as above. Then a Radon measure μ_X on X is *quasi-invariant* if the Radon measures ν and ν^{-1} on X defined by

$$\phi(f) = \int_G f \,\mathrm{d}\nu := \int_X \sum_{\gamma \in t^{-1}(x)} f(\gamma)\,\mathrm{d}\mu_X(x), \tag{5.1}$$

$$\psi(f) = \int_G f \,\mathrm{d}\nu^{-1} := \int_X \sum_{\gamma \in s^{-1}(x)} f(\gamma)\,\mathrm{d}\mu_X(x) \tag{5.2}$$

are equivalent. We call μ_X *continuously quasi-invariant* if the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\delta := \mathrm{d}\nu^{-1}/\mathrm{d}\nu$ and its inverse are continuous. Given a function $f \in C(G)$ such that $\operatorname{supp} f \cap X$ is compact, we define

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}(f) := \int_X f(x)\,\mathrm{d}\mu_X(x). \tag{5.3}$$

5.1.2. **Theorem.** *Let G be an étale, locally compact, second countable, Hausdorff groupoid with unit space X, target and source maps $t, s\colon G \to X$, multiplication $m\colon G_s{\times_t}G \to G$, inversion $j\colon G \to G$, and let μ_X be a Radon measure on X which is continuously quasi-invariant and has full support. Define $\phi, \psi, \tilde{\varepsilon}$ as in* (5.1), (5.2) *and* (5.3), *respectively. Then the multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ in Proposition 5.1.1 and the functionals $\mu_B := \tilde{\varepsilon}|_B$, $\mu_C := \tilde{\varepsilon}|_C$, ϕ and ψ form a measured multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid.*

Proof. The functionals μ_B, μ_C, ϕ and ψ are evidently positive, and faithful because μ_X has full support by assumption. By construction, $\mu_B \circ S_C = \mu_C$, $\mu_C \circ S_B = \mu_B$, $\mu_B \circ {}_B\varepsilon = \mu_C \circ {}_C\varepsilon$. One easily verifies that ϕ and ψ can be written in the form $\phi = \mu_C \circ {}_C\phi_C$ and $\psi = \mu_B \circ {}_B\psi_B$, where

$$({}_C\phi_C(f))(\gamma') = \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in G \\ t(\gamma') = t(\gamma)}} f(\gamma), \qquad ({}_B\psi_B(f))(\gamma') = \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in G \\ s(\gamma') = s(\gamma)}} f(\gamma),$$

These relations and the fact that $\psi = \delta \cdot \phi$, where $\delta = \mathrm{d}\nu^{-1}/\mathrm{d}\nu$, imply that ϕ and ψ lie in ${}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$. Straightforward calculations show that ${}_C\phi_C$ and ${}_B\psi_B$ are left- or right-invariant, respectively. □

Let us describe the dual measured Hopf $*$-algebroid. Recall that the space $C_c(G)$ is a $*$-algebra with respect to the convolution product and involution given by

$$(f * g)(\gamma) = \sum_{\gamma'\gamma'' = \gamma} f(\gamma')g(\gamma''), \qquad f^*(\gamma) = \overline{f(\gamma^{-1})}\delta(\gamma)$$

for all $f, g \in C_c(G)$ and $\gamma \in G$. We denote this $*$-algebra by $\mathbb{C}_c(G)$. Note that we can regard $C_c(X)$ as a subspace of $C_c(G)$ because $X \subseteq G$ is closed and open, G being Hausdorff and étale, and that then $C_c(X)$ is a subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}_c(G)$.

Observe furthermore that the subspace $G^{[2]} := (G_s{\times_s}G) \cap (G_t{\times_t}G)$ of $G \times G$ is a groupoid with unit space X, target and source maps $t \circ \pi_1 = t \circ \pi_2$ and $s \circ \pi_1 = s \circ \pi_2$,

respectively, where $\pi_i\colon G^{[2]} \to G$ denotes the canonical projection, and component-wise multiplication.

5.1.3. **Theorem.** *Let G be an étale, locally compact, second countable, Hausdorff groupoid with a continuously quasi-invariant Radon measure μ_X of full support, and denote by $(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \phi, \psi)$ the associated measured multiplier Hopf $*$-algebroid defined in Theorem 5.1.2. Then the dual $*$-algebra $\hat{A}$ can be identified with $\mathbb{C}_c(G)$, the dual left and right quantum graphs $(\hat{B}, \hat{A}, \iota_{\hat{B}}, \hat{S}_{\hat{B}})$ and $(\hat{C}, \hat{A}, \iota_{\hat{C}}, \hat{S}_{\hat{C}})$ coincide and are given by $\hat{B} = \hat{C} = C_c(X) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}_c(G)$ and $\hat{S}_{\hat{B}} = \hat{S}_{\hat{C}} = \iota$, and the dual comultiplications $\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{B}}$ and $\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{C}}$ take values in the algebras $\hat{A}_{\hat{B}}{\times}\hat{A}$ and $\hat{A} \times_{\hat{C}} \hat{A}$, which can be identified with the space $\mathbb{C}_c(G^{[2]})$. These dual comultiplications and the dual counit, antipode, integrals and their modular automorphism are given by*

$$(\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{B}}(f))(\gamma, \gamma') = (\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{C}}(f))(\gamma, \gamma') = \delta_{\gamma,\gamma'} f(\gamma),$$

$$\hat{\varepsilon}(f) = \phi(f), \quad \hat{S}(f)(\gamma) = f(\gamma^{-1})\delta(\gamma), \quad \hat{\phi}(f) = \hat{\psi}(f) = \varepsilon(f), \quad (\sigma^{\hat{\phi}}(f))(\gamma) = f(\gamma)\delta^{-1}(\gamma)$$

for all $f \in C_c(G)$ and $\gamma, \gamma' \in G$, where $\delta^{-1} = \mathrm{d}\nu / \mathrm{d}\nu^{-1}$.

Proof. By definition, $\hat{A} \subseteq C_c(G)^\vee$ is the space of all functionals of the form

$$\hat{f} := f \cdot \phi\colon g \mapsto \phi(gf) = \int_G gf \,\mathrm{d}\nu,$$

where $f \in C_c(G)$. By (4.1), the multiplication on $\hat{A}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f} * \hat{g} = \hat{h} \quad \text{with} \quad h(\gamma) &= ((_C\phi_C \otimes \iota)(T_\lambda^{-1}(f \otimes g)))(\gamma) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\gamma' \in G \\ t(\gamma') = t(\gamma)}} f(\gamma') g(\gamma'^{-1}\gamma) = \sum_{\gamma'\gamma'' = \gamma} f(\gamma') g(\gamma'') \end{aligned}$$

for all $f, g \in C_c(G)$. The involution on $\hat{A}$ is defined by

$$(\hat{f})^*(g) = \left(\int_G f S(g)^* \,\mathrm{d}\nu \right)^* = \int_G \overline{f(\gamma)} g(\gamma^{-1}) \,\mathrm{d}\nu(\gamma) = \int_G \overline{f(\gamma^{-1})} g(\gamma) \delta(\gamma) \,\mathrm{d}\nu(\gamma).$$

The embedding $\hat{B} = C \to M(\hat{A})$ is given by

$$t^*(h)\hat{f} = t^*(h) f \cdot \phi = \widehat{t^*(h) f} = \hat{h} * \hat{f}, \quad \hat{f} t^*(h) = S^{-1}(t^*(h)) f \cdot \phi = \widehat{s^*(h) f} = \hat{f} * \hat{h}$$

for all $f \in C_c(G)$ and $h \in C_c(X)$. We can therefore identify $\hat{B}$ with $\widehat{C_c(X)}$. A similar caclulation shows that the same is true for $\hat{C}$ and that then $\hat{S}_{\hat{B}}$ and $\hat{S}_{\hat{C}}$ reduce to the identity.

There exist natural isomorphisms $\hat{A} \underset{\hat{l}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \cong C_c(G_t{\times_t}G)$ and $\hat{A} \underset{\hat{r}}{\otimes} \hat{A} \cong C_c(G_s{\times_s}G)$, which map a tensor $\hat{f} \otimes \hat{g}$ to the function $(\gamma, \gamma') \mapsto f(\gamma) g(\gamma')$, and these maps induce isomorphisms $\hat{A}_{\hat{B}}{\times}\hat{A} \cong \mathbb{C}_c(G^{[2]}) \cong \hat{A} \times_{\hat{C}} \hat{A}$. To compute the dual comultiplication, let

$f \in C_c(G)$ and choose $h \in C_c(X)$ such that $fs^*(h) = f$. Then for all $g, g' \in C_c(G)$,

$$\begin{aligned}(\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{B}}(\hat{f})(1 \otimes \hat{h}))(g \otimes g') &= (\hat{f} \underset{r}{\otimes} \hat{h})((g \otimes 1)\Delta_C(g')) \\ &= \int_G \sum_{\substack{\gamma' \in G \\ r(\gamma') = s(\gamma)}} f(\gamma)h(\gamma')g(\gamma)g'(\gamma\gamma')\,\mathrm{d}\nu(\gamma) \\ &= \int_G f(\gamma)g(\gamma)g'(\gamma)\,\mathrm{d}\nu(\gamma).\end{aligned}$$

The formula for $\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{B}}$ follows, and a similar calculation applies to $\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{C}}$.

Let us next prove the formula for the dual antipode $\hat{S}$. For all $f, g \in C_c(G)$,

$$\begin{aligned}(\hat{S}(\hat{f}))(g) = \phi(fS(g)) &= \int_G f(\gamma)g(\gamma^{-1})\,\mathrm{d}\nu(\gamma) \\ &= \int_G f(\gamma^{-1})g(\gamma)\delta(\gamma)\,\mathrm{d}\nu(\gamma) = \widehat{(j(f)\delta)}(g).\end{aligned}$$

The formulas for $\hat{\varepsilon}, \hat{\phi}, \hat{\psi}$ follow more or less directly from the definitions. The formula for $\sigma^{\hat{\psi}}$ can be deduced from Theorem 4.3.1. More directly, the definitions imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\phi}(f * g) &= \int_X \sum_{\gamma\gamma' = x} f(\gamma')g(\gamma'')\,\mathrm{d}\mu_X(x) \\ &= \int_G f(\gamma^{-1})g(\gamma)\,\mathrm{d}\nu^{-1}(\gamma) \\ &= \int_G g(\gamma)(f\delta^{-1})(\gamma^{-1})\,\mathrm{d}\nu(\gamma) \\ &= \int_X \sum_{\gamma\gamma' = x} g(\gamma)(f\delta^{-1})(\gamma^{-1})\,\mathrm{d}\mu_X(x) = \hat{\phi}(g * (f\delta^{-1}))\end{aligned}$$

for all $f, g \in \mathbb{C}_c(G)$, where $f\delta^{-1}$ denotes the pointwise product. □

5.2. **A two-sided crossed product.** As a second example, we consider a two-sided crossed product that arises as a two-sided crossed product $C \rtimes H \ltimes B$ for compatible actions of a multiplier Hopf algebra H on two anti-isomorphic algebras B, C. This example appeared already in the work of Connes and Moscovici on transverse geometry in [11] and was put into the framework of multiplier Hopf algebroids in [40]. We show that invariant functionals on B and C and integrals on H yield integrals on $C \rtimes H \ltimes B$, and describe the dual multiplier Hopf algebroid.

Recall from [14] that a *right action* of a multiplier Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H} = (H, \Delta_H)$ on an algebra B is a non-degenerate right H-module structure on B, written $x \triangleleft h$, such that $(xx') \triangleleft h = \sum (x \triangleleft h_{(1)})(x' \triangleleft h_{(2)})$ for all $h \in H$ and $x, x' \in B$, where the right hand side makes sense due to the assumption that $B \triangleleft H = B$. Left actions of $\mathcal{H}$ on an algebra C are defined accordingly and written in the form $h \triangleright y$, where $y \in C$ and $h \in H$.

We define a *coupled pair of algebras*, briefly denoted $(S_B \colon B \rightleftarrows C : S_C)$, to be two non-degenerate, idempotent algebras B and C with anti-isomorphisms $S_B \colon B \to C$ and $S_C \colon C \to B$. An *action* of a multiplier Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H}$ as above on a coupled pair of

algebras $(S_B\colon B \rightleftarrows C : S_C)$ is a right action of $\mathcal{H}$ on B and a left action of $\mathcal{H}$ on C such that

$$S_B(x \triangleleft h) = S_H(h) \triangleright S_B(x), \qquad S_C(h \triangleright y) = S_C(y) \triangleleft S_H(h) \tag{5.4}$$

for all $x \in B$, $y \in C$ and $h \in H$. Given such an action, the vector space $C \otimes H \otimes B$ becomes a non-degenerate, idempotent algebra with respect to the multiplication given by

$$(y \otimes h \otimes x)(y' \otimes h' \otimes x') = \sum y(h_{(1)} \triangleright y') \otimes h_{(2)}h'_{(1)} \otimes (x \triangleleft h'_{(2)})x'$$

for all $x, x' \in B$, $y, y' \in C$, $h, h' \in H$. We denote this algebra by $C \rtimes H \ltimes B$ and call it the *crossed product* associated to the action. One easily verifies that this crossed product can be characterized as the universal algebra A with non-degenerate embeddings $B, C, H \hookrightarrow M(A)$ such that $A = CHB \subseteq M(A)$ and

$$xy = yx, \qquad xh = \sum h_{(1)}(x \triangleleft h_{(2)}), \qquad hy = \sum (h_{(1)} \triangleright y)h_{(2)}$$

for all $x \in B$, $y \in C$, $h \in H$. Note that the last two relations imply

$$hx = \sum (x \triangleleft S_H^{-1}(h_{(2)}))h_{(1)}, \qquad yh = \sum h_{(2)}(S_H^{-1}(h_{(1)}) \triangleright y). \tag{5.5}$$

5.2.1. **Proposition.** *Let $(S_B\colon B \rightleftarrows C\colon S_C)$ be a coupled pair of algebras with an action of a regular multiplier Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H} = (H, \Delta_H)$, and let $A = C \rtimes H \ltimes B$. Then $\mathcal{A}_B := (B, A, \iota_B, S_B)$ and $\mathcal{A}_C := (C, A, \iota_C, S_C)$ are compatible left and right quantum graphs, there exist a left and a right comultiplication Δ_B for $\mathcal{A}_B$ and Δ_C for $\mathcal{A}_C$ such that*

$$\Delta_B(yhx)(a \otimes b) = \sum yh_{(1)}a \otimes h_{(2)}xb, \qquad (a \otimes b)\Delta_C(yhx) = \sum ayh_{(1)} \otimes bh_{(2)}x$$

for all $a, b \in A$, $x \in B$, $y \in C$, $h \in H$, and $\mathcal{A} = ((\mathcal{A}_B, \Delta_B), (\mathcal{A}_C, \Delta_C))$ is a projective regular multiplier Hopf algebroid with antipode and counits given by

$${}_B\varepsilon(yhx) = (x \triangleleft S_H^{-1}(h))S_B^{-1}(y), \quad \varepsilon_C(yhx) = S_C^{-1}(x)(S_H^{-1}(h) \triangleright y), \tag{5.6}$$

$$S(yhx) = S_B(x)S_H(h)S_C(y) \tag{5.7}$$

for all $x \in B$, $y \in C$, $h \in H$.

Proof. Most parts of the statement summarise a construction in Section 8 of [40] up to a switch between left and right actions. The formulas for the left and right counit follow from the relations ${}_B\varepsilon(xyh) = xS_B^{-1}(y)\varepsilon_H(h)$ and $\varepsilon_C(hxy) = S_C^{-1}(x)y\varepsilon_H(h)$, respectively, which are contained in [40], and (5.5). Note that the algebra A is free as a B- or C-module and hence projective. □

We define a *base weight* for a coupled pair of algebras $(S_B\colon B \rightleftarrows C\colon S_C)$ to be a pair of faithful functionals $\mu = (\mu_B, \mu_C)$, where $\mu_B \in B^\vee$ and $\mu_C \in C^\vee$, such that $\mu_C \circ S_B = \mu_B$, $\mu_B \circ S_C = \mu_C$ and $\sigma_B^\mu := S_B^{-1} \circ S_C^{-1}$ and $\sigma_C^\mu := S_B \circ S_C$ are modular automorphisms for μ_B and μ_C, respectively. We call such a base weight *invariant* with respect to an action of a multiplier Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H} = (H, \Delta_H)$ if

$$\mu_B(h \triangleright x) = \varepsilon_H(h)\mu_B(x), \qquad \mu_C(y \triangleleft h) = \mu_C(y)\varepsilon_H(y) \tag{5.8}$$

for all $x \in B$, $y \in C$, $h \in H$. Note that this relation implies

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_C((h \triangleright y)y') &= \sum \mu_C((h_{(1)} \triangleright y)(h_{(2)} S_H(h_{(3)}) \triangleright y')) \\ &= \sum \mu_C(h_{(1)} \triangleright (y(S_H(h_{(2)}) \triangleright y'))) = \mu_C(y(S_H(h) \triangleright y'))\end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

for all $y, y' \in C$, and likewise $\mu_B(x(x' \triangleleft h)) = \mu_B((x \triangleleft S_H(h))x')$ for all $x, x' \in B$.

5.2.2. **Theorem.** *Let $(S_B\colon B \rightleftarrows C\colon S_C)$ be a coupled pair of algebras with an action of a regular multiplier Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H} = (H, \Delta_H)$ and an invariant base weight $\mu = (\mu_B, \mu_C)$, and let ϕ_H be a left and ψ_H a right integral on $\mathcal{H}$. Then the regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ defined in Proposition 5.2.1 and the functionals μ_B, μ_C and*

$$\phi\colon yhx \mapsto \mu_C(y)\phi_H(h)\mu_B(x), \qquad \psi\colon yhx \mapsto \mu_C(y)\psi_H(h)\mu_B(x)$$

form a measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid. Denote by $\sigma_H^\phi, \sigma_H^\psi$ and δ_H the modular automorphisms of ϕ_H and ψ_H and the modular element of $\mathcal{H}$, respectively. Then the modular automorphisms of ϕ and ψ are given by

$$\sigma^\phi(yhx) = \sigma_C^\mu(y)\sigma_H^\phi(h)(\sigma_B^\mu(x) \triangleleft \delta_H), \qquad \sigma^\psi(yhx) = (\delta_H \triangleright \sigma_C^\mu(y))\sigma_H^\psi(h)\sigma_B^\mu(x),$$

and $\psi = \delta \cdot \phi$, where $\delta \in M(H)$ denotes the unique multiple of δ_H satisfying $\delta \cdot \phi_H = \psi_H$.

Proof. Throughout this proof, x, x', y, y' and h, h' will always denote arbitrary elements of B, C or H, respectively.

To see that μ is a base weight for $\mathcal{A}$, we use equations (5.6), (5.4), (5.9) and the modular automorphism for μ_C, and find

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_B({}_B\varepsilon(yhx)) &= \mu_B((x \triangleleft S_H^{-1}(h))S_B^{-1}(y)) \\ &= \mu_C(y(h \triangleright S_B(x))) \\ &= \mu_C((S_H^{-1}(h) \triangleright y)S_B(x)) \\ &= \mu_C(S_C^{-1}(x)(S_H^{-1}(h) \triangleright y)) = \mu_C(\varepsilon_C(yhx)).\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

Next, we show that the formula for ϕ defines a full and faithful left integral. First, we check that ϕ belongs to ${}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$. By [43], ϕ_H has a modular automorphism σ_H^ϕ and there exists an invertible multiplier $\delta_H \in M(H)$ such that $\sum \phi_H(h_{(1)})h_{(2)} = \delta_H \phi_H(h)$ for all $h \in H$. Using this relation, left invariance of ϕ_H and (5.8), we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(x'yhx) &= \sum \phi(yh_{(1)}(x' \triangleleft h_{(2)})x) \\ &= \sum \mu_C(y)\phi_H(h_{(1)})\mu_B((x' \triangleleft h_{(2)})x) = \mu_C(y)\phi_H(h)\mu_B((x' \triangleleft \delta_H)x), \\ \phi(yhxy') &= \sum \phi(y(h_{(1)} \triangleright y')h_{(2)}x) \\ &= \sum \mu_C(y(h_{(1)} \triangleright y'))\phi_H(h_{(2)})\mu_B(x) = \mu_C(yy')\phi_H(h)\mu_B(x).\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

These relations imply that $\phi \in {}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$ and

$${}_C\phi(yhx) = y\phi_H(h)\mu_B(x) = \phi_C(yhx), \tag{5.12}$$

$$\phi_B(x'yh) = \mu_C(y)\phi_H(h)(x' \triangleleft \delta_H), \quad {}_B\phi(yhx) = \mu_C(y)\phi_H(h)(x \triangleleft \delta_H^{-1}), \tag{5.13}$$

where we used the relation $\delta_H^{-1} = S_H(\delta_H)$ and the analogue of (5.9) for μ_B. Since δ_H is invertible, ϕ_B and ${}_B\phi$ are surjective.

The map ${}_C\phi_C$ is left-invariant because for all $a \in A$,

$$\begin{aligned}(\iota \otimes {}_C\phi_C)((a \otimes 1)\Delta_C(yhx)) &= \sum (\iota \otimes {}_C\phi_C)(ayh_{(1)} \otimes h_{(2)}x)\\ &= \sum ayh_{(1)}\phi_H(h_{(2)})\mu_B(x)\\ &= \sum ay\phi_H(h)\mu_B(x) = a_C\phi_C(yhx).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, ϕ is a full left integral. By Theorem 3.6.1, it is faithful.

Let us prove the formula for the modular automorphism σ^ϕ. By Theorem 3.4.4, $\sigma^\phi(y) = \sigma^\mu_C(y)$ for all $y \in C$. Equation (5.11) shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(yhx\sigma^\mu_B(x' \triangleleft \delta_H)) &= \mu_C\phi_H(h)\mu_B(x\sigma^\mu_B(x' \triangleleft \delta_H))\\ &= \mu_C\phi_H(h)\mu_B((x' \triangleleft \delta_H)x) = \phi(x'yhx),\end{aligned}$$

and hence $\sigma^\phi(x') = \sigma^\mu_B(x' \triangleleft \delta_H)$. Next,

$$\phi(h'yhx) = \sum \phi((h'_{(1)} \triangleright y)h'_{(2)}hx) = \mu_C(y)\phi_H(h'h)\mu_B(x),$$

and a similar calculation shows that

$$\phi(yhx\sigma^\phi_H(h')) = \mu_C(y)\phi_H(h\sigma^\phi_H(h'))\mu_B(x) = \mu_C(y)\phi_H(h'h)\mu_B(x).$$

Therefore, $\sigma^\phi(h') = \sigma^\phi_H(h')$. Replacing $\sigma^\phi_H(h')$ by $\delta \in M(H)$ above, we find that the relation $\delta \cdot \phi_H = \psi_H$ implies $\delta \cdot \phi = \psi$.

Similar arguments show that ψ is a full and faithful right integral and that its modular automorphism has the claimed form, where one uses the relations $\sum h_{(1)}\psi_H(h_{(2)}) = \delta_H^{-1}\psi_H(h)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(yhxy') &= \sum \psi(y(h_{(1)} \triangleright y')h_{(2)}x)\\ &= \sum \mu_C(y(h_{(1)} \triangleright y'))\psi_H(h_{(2)})\mu_B(x) = \mu_C(y(\delta_H^{-1} \triangleright y'))\psi_H(h)\mu_B(x).\end{aligned}$$ □

We finally describe the dual measured regular multiplier Hopf algebroid. In the situation of Theorem 5.2.2, denote by $K^\mu_B \subseteq \mathrm{End}(B)$ the subspace spanned by all linear maps of the form $|x\rangle\langle x'| \colon x'' \mapsto x\mu_B(x'x'')$, where $x, x' \in B$, and denote by $\hat{\mathcal{H}} = (\hat{H}, \hat{\Delta}_{\hat{H}})$ the dual of $\mathcal{H} = (H, \Delta_H)$.

5.2.3. **Theorem.** *Let $(S_B \colon B \rightleftarrows C \colon S_C)$ be a coupled pair of algebras with an action of a regular multiplier Hopf algebra $\mathcal{H} = (H, \Delta_H)$ and an invariant base weight $\mu = (\mu_B, \mu_C)$, and let ϕ_H be a left and ψ_H a right integral on $\mathcal{H}$. Then there exists an isomorphism*

$$\hat{A} \to K^\mu_B \otimes \hat{H}, \quad hS_B(x) \cdot \phi \cdot x' \mapsto |x\rangle\langle x'| \otimes h \cdot \phi_H.$$

With respect to this isomorphism, the embeddings $\hat{B}, \hat{C} \to M(\hat{A})$ are given by

$$x''(|x\rangle\langle x'| \otimes h \cdot \phi_H) = |x''x\rangle\langle x'| \otimes h \cdot \phi_H, \tag{5.14}$$

$$S_C^{-1}(x'')(|x\rangle\langle x'| \otimes h \cdot \phi_H) = \sum |x\sigma^\mu_B(x'' \triangleleft h_{(1)})\rangle\langle x'| \otimes h_{(2)} \cdot \phi_H \tag{5.15}$$

for all $x, x', x'' \in B$, $h \in H$. The comultiplications, counit, antipode and integrals on $(\hat{\mathcal{A}}, \hat{\mu}, \hat{\phi}, \hat{\psi})$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{B}}(a)(1_{M(\hat{A})} \otimes (|x''\rangle\langle x'''| \otimes \omega')) &= \sum (|x\rangle\langle x'| \otimes \omega_{(1)}) S(x'') \otimes (|1\rangle\langle x'''| \otimes \omega_{(2)}\omega'), \\
\hat{\varepsilon}(a) = \mu_B(x)\mu_B(x')\hat{\varepsilon}_{\hat{H}}(\omega), &\quad \hat{S}(a) = S_C^{-1}(x')(|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \hat{S}_{\hat{H}}(\omega))S_C^{-1}(x), \\
\hat{\phi}(a) = \mu_B(xx')\hat{\phi}_{\hat{H}}(\omega), &\quad \hat{\psi}(a) = \mu_B((x \triangleleft \delta_H^{-1})x')\hat{\psi}_{\hat{H}}(\omega)
\end{aligned}$$

for $a = |x\rangle\langle x'| \otimes \omega \in K_B^\mu \otimes \hat{H}$, where $\hat{\varepsilon}_{\hat{H}}$, $\hat{S}_{\hat{H}}$, $\hat{\phi}_{\hat{H}}$ and $\hat{\psi}_{\hat{H}}$ denote the counit, antipode and the left and right integrals on $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$, respectively, and where the formula for the comultiplication and antipode should be interpreted using (5.15).

Proof. Throughout the proof, x, x', x'', y, y', y'' and h, h', h'' denote arbitrary elements of B, C and H, respectively.

We first show that $\hat{A}$ is isomorphic to $K_B^\mu \otimes \hat{H}$. By definition

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho(hS_B(x) \cdot \phi \cdot x')(x''h''y'') &= \sum (\iota \otimes S_B^{-1} \circ {}_C\phi_C)(h''_{(1)}y'' \otimes x'x''h''_{(2)}hS_B(x)) \\
&= \sum \mu_B(x'x'')x\phi_H(h''_{(2)}h)h''_{(1)}y''.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

On the other hand, since $A \cong B \otimes H \otimes C$ via $x''h''y'' \equiv x'' \otimes h'' \otimes y''$ as a vector space, we can define an embedding $\pi\colon K_B^\mu \otimes \hat{H} \to \mathrm{End}(A)$ via the formula

$$\pi(|x\rangle\langle x'| \otimes h \cdot \phi_H)(x''h''y'') := \sum x\mu_B(x'x'')\phi_H(h''_{(2)}h)h''_{(1)}y''.$$

The composition $\pi^{-1} \circ \rho$ is the desired isomorphism $\hat{A} \to K_B \otimes \hat{H}$.

With respect to this isomorphism,

$$\begin{aligned}
x''(|x\rangle\langle x'| \otimes h \cdot \phi_H) &= hS_B(x) \cdot \phi \cdot x'S_C^{-1}(x'') \\
&= hS_B(x)S_B(x'') \cdot \phi \cdot x'x'' = |x''x\rangle\langle x'| \otimes h \cdot \phi_H
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
S_C^{-1}(x'')(|x\rangle\langle x'| \otimes h \cdot \phi_H) &= S_C^{-1}(x'')hS_B(x) \cdot \phi \cdot x' \\
&= \sum h_{(2)}(S_H^{-1}(h_{(1)}) \triangleright S_C^{-1}(x''))S_B(x) \cdot \phi \cdot x' \\
&= \sum h_{(2)}S_B(x\sigma_B^\mu(x'' \triangleleft h_{(1)})) \cdot \phi \cdot x' \\
&= \sum |x\sigma_B^\mu(x'' \triangleleft h_{(1)})\rangle\langle x'| \otimes h_{(2)} \cdot \phi_H.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us compute the dual counit $\hat{\varepsilon}$ and the dual integrals $\hat{\psi}, \hat{\phi}$. First,

$$\hat{\varepsilon}(|x\rangle\langle x'| \otimes h \cdot \phi) = \hat{\varepsilon}(hS_B(x) \cdot \phi \cdot x') = \phi(x'hS_B(x)) = \mu_B(x')\phi_H(h)\mu_B(x).$$

The definition of $\hat{\psi}$ and relation (5.10) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\psi}(|x\rangle\langle x'| \otimes h \cdot \phi_H) &= \hat{\psi}(hS_B(x) \cdot \phi \cdot x') \\
&= \varepsilon(hS_B(x)\sigma^\phi(x')) \\
&= \mu_C(((S_H^{-1}(h_{(2)})h_{(1)}) \triangleright S_B(x))S_B(\sigma^\phi(x'))) = \mu_B(\sigma^\phi(x')x)\varepsilon_H(h).
\end{aligned}$$

We insert the formula for $\sigma^\phi(x')$, use (5.9), and find

$$\hat\psi(|x\rangle\langle x'|\otimes h\cdot\phi_H)=\mu_B((\sigma^\mu_B(x')\triangleleft\delta_H)x)=\mu_B((x\triangleleft\delta_H^{-1})x')\hat\psi_H(h\cdot\phi_H).$$

The definition of $\hat\phi$ and the relation $\psi=\delta\cdot\phi$ imply

$$\begin{aligned}\hat\phi(|x\rangle\langle x'|\otimes\psi_H\cdot h)&=\hat\phi(|x\rangle\langle x'|\otimes\delta\sigma^\phi(h)\cdot\phi_H)\\&=\hat\phi(\delta\sigma^\phi(h)S_B(x)\cdot\phi\cdot x')=\hat\phi(\psi\cdot hS_C^{-1}(x)x')=\varepsilon(hS_C^{-1}(x)x').\end{aligned}$$

Using (5.10) similarly as above, we find

$$\hat\phi(|x\rangle\langle x'|\otimes\psi_H\cdot h)=\mu_B(x'S_B^{-1}S_C^{-1}(x))\varepsilon_H(h)=\mu_B(xx')\hat\phi_{\hat H}(\psi_H\cdot h).$$

The verification of the formula for the antipode is straightforward.

Let us finally prove the formula for the left comultiplication $\hat\Delta_{\hat B}$. Consider elements

$$\upsilon=hS(x)\cdot\phi\cdot x'=|x\rangle\langle x'|\otimes h\cdot\phi_H,\qquad \upsilon'=h'S(x'')\cdot\phi\cdot x'''=|x''\rangle\langle x'''|\otimes h'\cdot\phi_H$$

of $\hat A$. Write $\omega:=h\cdot\phi_H$ and $\omega':=h'\cdot\phi_H$, choose $g_i,g_i'\in H$ such that

$$\sum\omega_{(1)}\otimes\omega_{(2)}\omega'=\sum_i g_i\cdot\phi_H\otimes g_i'\cdot\phi_H$$

and write

$$\begin{aligned}\upsilon_i''&:=(x''g_iS(x)\cdot\phi\cdot x')=(g_iS(x)\cdot\phi\cdot x')S(x'')=(|x\rangle\langle x'|\otimes g_i\cdot\phi_H)S(x''),\\ \upsilon_i'''&:=g_i'\cdot\phi\cdot x'''=|1\rangle\langle x'''|\otimes g_i'\cdot\phi_H.\end{aligned}$$

We have to show that

$$\hat\Delta_{\hat B}(\upsilon)(1\otimes\upsilon')=\sum_i\upsilon_i''\otimes\upsilon_i''',$$

and do so by evaluating both sides on elements $a\otimes b\in A\underset{C}{\otimes}A$ using dual versions of the embeddings in Lemma 4.4.6. Equation (4.11) implies

$$(\hat\Delta_{\hat B}(\upsilon)(1\otimes\upsilon'))(a^\vee\otimes b^\vee)=\upsilon(a\rho(\upsilon')(b))=\phi(x'a\rho(\upsilon')(b)hS(x)).$$

On the other side,

$$\sum_i(\upsilon_i''\underset{C}{\otimes}\upsilon_i''')(a\otimes b)=\sum_i\upsilon_i''(a_C\upsilon_i'''(b))=\sum_i\phi(x'a_C\upsilon_i'''(b)x''g_iS(x)).$$

Therefore, we only need to show that $\rho(\upsilon')(b)h=\sum_i{}_C\upsilon_i'''(b)x''g_i$. Take b of the form $b=\tilde x\tilde y\tilde h$. Using (5.16) and (5.5), we find that

$$\rho(\upsilon')(b)h=\rho(h'S_B(x'')\cdot\phi\cdot x''')(\tilde x\tilde y\tilde h)h=\sum\mu_B(x'''\tilde x)\phi_H(\tilde h_{(2)}h')x''\tilde y\tilde h_{(1)}h. \tag{5.17}$$

On the other side,

$$\sum_i{}_C\upsilon_i'''(b)x''g_i=\sum_i{}_C\phi_C(x'''\tilde x\tilde y\tilde hg_i')x''g_i=\sum_i\mu_B(x'''\tilde x)\phi_H(\tilde hg_i')\tilde yx''g_i. \tag{5.18}$$

To see that (5.17) and (5.18) coincide, we have to show that

$$\sum\phi_H(\tilde h_{(2)}h')\tilde h_{(1)}h=\sum_i\phi_H(\tilde hg_i')g_i.$$

We multiply on the left by some arbitrary $h'' \in H$, apply ϕ_H, and get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum \phi_H(\tilde{h}_{(2)}h')\phi_H(h''\tilde{h}_{(1)}h) &= \omega(h''\tilde{h}_{(1)})\omega'(\tilde{h}_{(2)}) \\ &= \sum \omega_{(1)}(h'')(\omega_{(2)}\omega')(\tilde{h}) = \sum \phi_H(h''g_i)\phi_H(\tilde{h}g_i').\end{aligned}$$

Since ϕ_H is faithful and $h'' \in H$ was arbitrary, the desired equality follows. □

Appendix A. Factorisable functionals on bimodules

In this appendix, we put the definition of the space ${}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$ associated to a regular multiplier Hopf algebroid $\mathcal{A}$ with base weight μ, and the construction of the relative tensor products for functionals in ${}_\mu A_\mu^\vee$ given at the beginning of Subsection 3.3 into a bicategorical perspective.

We denote by $(\mathrm{Bimod}_{\mathrm{KMS}})$ the bicategory whose

- 0-cells are algebras equipped with faithful KMS-functionals,
- 1-cells are bimodules between bialgebras, with the usual tensor product as composition,
- 2-cells are morphisms of bimodules, with the usual composition and tensor product.

Then there exists a lax bifunctor $D\colon (\mathrm{Bimod}_{\mathrm{KMS}}) \to (\mathrm{Bimod}_{\mathrm{KMS}})^{\mathrm{co}}$ as follows.

(1) On 0-cells, the functor D is given by $(A,\mu) \mapsto (A^{\mathrm{op}}, \mu^{\mathrm{op}})$.

(2) Given 0-cells (A,μ), (B,ν) and an A-B-bimodule M, consider the space

$$D(M) := \{\omega \in M^\vee \mid \exists {}_A\omega \in {}_A M^\vee, \omega_B \in M_B^\vee : \mu \circ {}_A\omega = \omega = \nu \circ \omega_B\}.$$

This space becomes a A^{op}-B^{op}-bimodule if we define

$$a^{\mathrm{op}}\omega := \omega(\sigma_\mu^{-1}(a)-), \qquad \omega b^{\mathrm{op}} := \omega(-\sigma_\nu(b)).$$

Indeed, one easily verifiies that $a\omega, \omega b \in D(M)$ and that

$$\begin{aligned} {}_A(a^{\mathrm{op}}\omega)(m) &= {}_A\omega(m)a, & (a^{\mathrm{op}}\omega)_B(m) &= \omega_B(\sigma_\mu^{-1}(a)m), \\ {}_A(\omega b^{\mathrm{op}})(m) &= {}_A\omega(m\sigma_\nu(b)), & (\omega b^{\mathrm{op}})_B(m) &= b\omega_B(m) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\omega \in D(M)$, $a \in A$, $b \in B$.

(3) Given 0-cells (A,μ), (B,ν) and a morphism of A-B-bimodules $T\colon M \to N$, there exists a morphism of A^{op}-B^{op}-bimodules $D(T)\colon D(N) \to D(M)$, $\omega \mapsto \omega \circ T$.

(4) Given a 0-cell (A,μ), there exists a morphism of A-bimodules ${}_A A_A \to D({}_{A^{\mathrm{op}}}A^{\mathrm{op}}_{A^{\mathrm{op}}})$ given by $a \mapsto \mu^{\mathrm{op}}(a^{\mathrm{op}}-)$.

(5) Given 0-cells (A,μ), (B,ν), (C,ϕ), an A-B-bimodule M and a B-C-bimodule N, there exists a morphism of A^{op}-C^{op}-bimodules $D(M)\otimes D(N) \to D(M\otimes N)$ such that

$$D(\omega\otimes\upsilon) = \omega\circ(\iota\otimes_B\upsilon) = \nu\circ(\omega_B\otimes{}_B\upsilon) = \upsilon\circ(\omega_B\otimes\iota)$$

and

$${}_A(D(\omega\otimes\upsilon)) = {}_A\omega\circ(\iota\otimes{}_B\upsilon), \qquad (D(\omega\otimes\upsilon))_C = \upsilon_C\circ(\omega_B\otimes\iota)$$

for all $\omega \in D(M)$, $\upsilon \in D(N)$.

Moreover, there exists a lax transformation $\sigma\colon \iota_{(\mathrm{Bimod}_{\mathrm{KMS}})} \to D^2$ as follows.

(6) For each 0-cell (A,μ), we have $D^2(A,\mu) = (A,\mu)$ so that we can take $\sigma_{(A,\mu)} = 1_{(A,\mu)} = {}_AA_A$.
(7) Given 0-cells (A,μ), (B,ν) and an A-B-bimodule M, there exists a morphism of A-bimodules $\sigma_M\colon M \to D^2(M)$ given by $(\sigma_M(m))(\omega) := \omega(m)$, and

$$ {}_A\sigma_M(m)(\omega) = {}_A\omega(m), \qquad\qquad \sigma_M(m)_B(\omega) = \omega_B(m). $$

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Alfons Van Daele for inspiring and fruitful discussions.

References

[1] G. Böhm. Integral theory for Hopf algebroids. *Algebr. Represent. Theory*, 8(4):563–599, 2005.
[2] G. Böhm. Hopf algebroids. In *Handbook of algebra. Vol. 6*, volume 6 of *Handb. Algebr.*, pages 173–235. Elsevier/North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2009.
[3] G. Böhm. Comodules over weak multiplier bialgebras. Technical report, arxiv.1311.2730v1, 2013.
[4] G. Böhm, F. Nill, and K. Szlachányi. Weak Hopf algebras. I. Integral theory and C^*-structure. *J. Algebra*, 221(2):385–438, 1999.
[5] G. Böhm and K. Szlachányi. Hopf algebroid symmetry of abstract Frobenius extensions of depth 2. *Comm. Algebra*, 32(11):4433–4464, 2004.
[6] G. Böhm and K. Szlachányi. Hopf algebroids with bijective antipodes: axioms, integrals, and duals. *J. Algebra*, 274(2):708–750, 2004.
[7] A. Bruguières, S. Lack, and A. Virelizier. Hopf monads on monoidal categories. *Adv. Math.*, 227(2):745–800, 2011.
[8] V. Chari and A. Pressley. *A guide to quantum groups*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
[9] D. Chikhladze. A category of quantum categories. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 25:No. 1, 1–37, 2011.
[10] D. Chikhladze, S. Lack, and R. Street. Hopf monoidal comonads. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 24:No. 19, 554–563, 2010.
[11] A. Connes and H. Moscovici. Rankin-Cohen brackets and the Hopf algebra of transverse geometry. *Mosc. Math. J.*, 4(1):111–130, 311, 2004.
[12] B. Day and R. Street. Quantum categories, star autonomy, and quantum groupoids. In *Galois theory, Hopf algebras, and semiabelian categories*, volume 43 of *Fields Inst. Commun.*, pages 187–225. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004.
[13] J. Donin and A. Mudrov. Quantum groupoids and dynamical categories. *J. Algebra*, 296(2):348–384, 2006.
[14] B. Drabant, A. Van Daele, and Y. Zhang. Actions of multiplier Hopf algebras. *Comm. Algebra*, 27(9):4117–4172, 1999.
[15] M. Enock. Inclusions of von Neumann algebras and quantum groupoïds. III. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 223(2):311–364, 2005.
[16] M. Enock. Measured quantum groupoids in action. *Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.)*, (114):ii+150 pp. (2009), 2008.
[17] M. Enock. Measured quantum groupoids in action. *Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.)*, (114):ii+150 pp. (2009), 2008.
[18] P. Etingof and A. Varchenko. Solutions of the quantum dynamical Yang-Baxter equation and dynamical quantum groups. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 196(3):591–640, 1998.
[19] P. H. Hai. Tannaka-Krein duality for Hopf algebroids. *Israel J. Math.*, 167:193–225, 2008.
[20] L. Kadison. Skew Hopf algebras, irreducible extensions and the Π-method. *Münster J. Math.*, 2:183–199, 2009.
[21] L. Kadison and K. Szlachányi. Bialgebroid actions on depth two extensions and duality. *Adv. Math.*, 179(1):75–121, 2003.
[22] E. Koelink and H. Rosengren. Harmonic analysis on the SU(2) dynamical quantum group. *Acta Appl. Math.*, 69(2):163–220, 2001.

[23] L. I. Korogodski and Y. S. Soibelman. *Algebras of functions on quantum groups. Part I*, volume 56 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998.
[24] J. Kustermans. The analytic structure of algebraic quantum groups. *J. Algebra*, 259(2):415–450, 2003.
[25] J. Kustermans and S. Vaes. Locally compact quantum groups. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 33(6):837–934, 2000.
[26] J. Kustermans and S. Vaes. The operator algebra approach to quantum groups. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 97(2):547–552 (electronic), 2000.
[27] J. Kustermans and A. Van Daele. C^*-algebraic quantum groups arising from algebraic quantum groups. *Internat. J. Math.*, 8(8):1067–1139, 1997.
[28] J. Kustermans and A. Van Daele. C^*-algebraic quantum groups arising from algebraic quantum groups. *Internat. J. Math.*, 8(8):1067–1139, 1997.
[29] F. Lesieur. Measured quantum groupoids. *Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.)*, (109):iv+158 pp. (2008), 2007.
[30] J.-H. Lu. Hopf algebroids and quantum groupoids. *Internat. J. Math.*, 7(1):47–70, 1996.
[31] M. B. McCurdy. Graphical methods for Tannaka duality of weak bialgebras and weak Hopf algebras. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 26:No. 9, 233–280, 2012.
[32] D. Nikshych and L. Vainerman. A characterization of depth 2 subfactors of II_1 factors. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 171(2):278–307, 2000.
[33] D. Nikshych and L. Vainerman. Finite quantum groupoids and their applications. In *New directions in Hopf algebras*, volume 43 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 211–262. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
[34] A. L. T. Paterson. *Groupoids, inverse semigroups, and their operator algebras*, volume 170 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1999.
[35] H. Pfeiffer. Tannaka-Kreĭn reconstruction and a characterization of modular tensor categories. *J. Algebra*, 321(12):3714–3763, 2009.
[36] J. Renault. *A groupoid approach to C^*-algebras*, volume 793 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, 1980.
[37] P. Schauenburg. Duals and doubles of quantum groupoids ($\times_R$-Hopf algebras). In *New trends in Hopf algebra theory (La Falda, 1999)*, volume 267 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 273–299. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.
[38] P. Schauenburg. Weak Hopf algebras and quantum groupoids. In *Noncommutative geometry and quantum groups (Warsaw, 2001)*, volume 61 of *Banach Center Publ.*, pages 171–188. Polish Acad. Sci., Warsaw, 2003.
[39] T. Timmermann. Measured quantum groupoids associated to proper dynamical quantum groups. Technical report, arxiv.1206.6744, 2012. to appear in J. Noncomm. Geometry.
[40] T. Timmermann and A. V. Daele. Regular multiplier Hopf algebroids. Basic theory and examples. Technical report, arXiv:1307.0769, 2013.
[41] T. Timmermann and A. Van Daele. Multiplier Hopf algebroids arising from weak multiplier Hopf algebras. in preparation.
[42] A. Van Daele. An algebraic framework for group duality. *Adv. Math.*, 140(2):323–366, 1998.
[43] A. Van Daele. An algebraic framework for group duality. *Adv. Math.*, 140(2):323–366, 1998.
[44] A. Van Daele. Separability idempotents and multiplier algebras. Technical report, arxiv.1301.4398v1, 2013.
[45] A. Van Daele and S. Wang. Weak multiplier Hopf algebras. Preliminaries, motivation and basic examples. In P. M. Soltan and W. Pusz, editors, *Operator Algebras and Quantum Groups*, volume 98 of *Banach Center Publ.*, pages 367–415. Polish Academy of Sciences, Polish Academy of Sciences, Institute of Mathematics, Warsaw, 2012.
[46] A. Van Daele and S. Wang. Weak multiplier Hopf algebras. The main theory. Technical report, Preprint University of Leuven (Belgium) and South East University of Nanjing (China), arXiv:1210.4395, 2012.
[47] P. Xu. Quantum groupoids. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 216(3):539–581, 2001.

FB Mathematik und Informatik, University of Muenster, Einsteinstr. 62, 48149 Muenster, Germany

E-mail address: timmermt@math.uni-muenster.de